

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. XLVI.

OCTOBER.

[Vol. IV.]

BIOGRAPHY.

MEMOIR OF BEILBY PORTEUS, D.D. BISHOP OF LONDON.

BEILBY PORTEUS, born about 1731, was the son of an inconsiderable tradesman resident in the county of York, whose family had removed from Scotland. After an education at the grammar school of Rippon he was entered at Christ's college, Cambridge, where, we have understood that he commenced as a *servitor*, or poor scholar. In 1752 he obtained the degree of bachelor of arts, and in the same year was a successful candidate for one of the gold medals granted by the chancellor of the university for the best classical essays. The other candidate who gained a medal was Mr. Maseres, now one of the Cursitor Barons and F. R. S.

In 1754, Mr. Porteus was elected one of the esquire beadles of the university, an office which he

resigned the following year, on becoming master of arts and fellow of his college. He now advanced an important step in the road of clerical preferment by being appointed a preacher at Whitehall, where he was one day to be consecrated a "Right Reverend Father in God," and in virtue of the alliance between church and state, to become a lord of parliament. Whether he might not even now, see in a bright vision "mitre and crozier dancing in his eyes," we are unable to determine.

In 1759, Mr. P. was again a successful candidate. The Seatonian prize* was adjudged to him for his Poem on death which has been frequently reprinted, and is still deservedly popular. The following passage in this poem has

* "The Rev Thomas Seaton born at Stamford in Lincolnshire," and who died about 1750, by his will left an estate to the university of Cambridge for ever; "the rents to be disposed of yearly, as the vice-chancellor, the master of Clare-hall, and the Greek professor for the time being, or any two of them shall agree." The first subject to be "one or other of the perfections or attributes of the Supreme Being, afterwards the subject shall be either death, judgment, heaven, hell, purity of heart, &c. or whatever else may be judged to be most conducive to the honour of the Supreme Being, and recommendation of virtue. The rent of the estate to be disposed of to that master of arts whose poem on the subject given shall be best approved by them. The poem to be always in English, and to be printed." "*Musæ Seatonianæ*."—A complete collection of the Cambridge prize poems.—Ad. p. 5. 7.

been often quoted, and the author, we believe, in his highest station, was once reminded of the indignant strains in which his youthful muse had characterized war, and war-loving monarchs.

—One murder made a villain,
Millions a hero—Princes were privileg'd
To kill, and numbers sanctified the
crime.
Ah! why will kings forget that they
are men!
And men that they are brethren? why
delight
In human sacrifice? Why burst the ties
Of nature, that should knit their souls
together,
In one soft bond of amity and love?
Yet still they breathe destruction, still
go on
Inhumanly ingenious to find out
New pains for life, new terrors for the
grave,
Artificers of death! still monarchs
dream
Of universal empire growing up
From universal ruin*.—

The muse of Mr. Porteus soon indulged to more courtly strains. On the death of George the second, he produced an epitaph sufficiently panegyric, not forgetting a *suitable* compliment "to young George," who is said to "blend all his grandsire's virtues with his own." The same event proved the happy occasion of providing for Mr. P. a patron who appears to have laid the foundation of his future high advancement in the church.

The celebrated nonconformist Dr. Chandler, who like his brethren of that age almost idolized the house of Brunswick, published a sermon on the death of George

the second. It was entitled "The Character of a Great and Good King, full of Days, Riches, and Honour." From the Text, 1 Chron. xxix. 27, 28. a comparison is made between the British monarch and King David. The character of David was certainly too problematical to form a great example. It was presently attacked in a piece replete with that sarcasm and virulence which Deistical writers, have so often displayed, though with no *professed* hostility to Divine revelation. To this anonymous publication entitled "The History of the Man after God's own Heart," Dr. Chandler replied with great advantage, detecting the author's misrepresentations of scripture in many instances, and vindicating with some success the character of the Jewish Monarch. Other divines engaged in the controversy. Among the rest Mr. P. published a sermon preached before the university of Cambridge, entitled "The character of David King of Israel impartially stated†."

This sermon attracting the notice of Dr. Secker, then archbishop of Canterbury, he immediately appointed the author "one of his domestic chaplains and soon after presented him in succession to two rectories in Kent and one in Middlesex. A prebendal stall in Peterborough followed at no great distance." In 1765 Mr. P. married Miss Hodgson, a lady of Matlock, who has survived him. In 1767 he was presented by the

* Id. P. 131.

† The author of "the History of the Man after God's own Heart," thus notices this publication in his "Letter to the Rev. S. Chandler:"—"After what has been pleaded against the charges contained in the most capital performance on the defensive side of this dispute, it is hoped that the Rev. Messrs. Porteus and Cleaver, will not continue to think this writer quite so unfair and abandoned as they have represented him to be.—"Letter," &c. P. 106

archbishop to the rectory of Lambeth, and about the same time the degree of D. D. was conferred on him by his own University.

With Lambeth, Dr. Porteus was allowed to hold the rectory of Hunton, in Kent. Thus bountifully, during the short period of their connection, did Secker dispense to his favourite chaplain the good things of the church, leaving him also at his death in 1768 his *option** of "the mastership of the hospital of St. Cross," a charitable institution near Winchester.

In 1770 our divine evinced his gratitude to a deceased patron in "A Review of his Grace's Life and Character,†" prefixed to a publication of the archbishop's works by his chaplains, Doctors Porteus and Stinton. There was one period in the life of Secker, which his biographer appeared willing to pass over as quickly as possible. That Churchman who had, the rare good fortune in his prelatical capacity, to christen, marry, and crown, the same king, had like his friend and contemporary Bishop Butler, been bred and grown up to manhood a nonconformist. At an early age, by the favour of Dr. Watts, as he gratefully acknowledges, he had been

admitted into a dissenting academy at Gloucester. There is extant a letter from Secker to Watts in which he speaks highly of the advantages he enjoyed in that seminary. He also expresses his grateful sense of the abilities and attention of his tutor, whom Dr. Porteus, not having then seen this letter, passes over somewhat slightly, as "one Mr. Jones, who kept an academy at Gloucester‡."

However unwilling our divine might be to compliment dissenting academies, he appeared at this time disposed to promote a reform in the institutions of the establishment. In 1772 there was an attempt to procure "relief to the clergy, and the two professions of law and physic, in the matter of subscription to the liturgy and thirty-nine articles of the church of England." Previous to the larger "association of the clergy-society at the Feathers," Dr. P. was one of a few clergymen who met at Tennison's library, and made application on the subject to the "governors of the church." These dignitaries replied "that in their opinion it was neither prudent nor safe to do any thing in the matter||." To this judgment our now rising divine conformed

* "When a new suffragan bishop is consecrated, the archbishop of the province claims the collation of the first vacant benefice, or dignity in that see, as he shall choose; which choice is called his *option*. If the archbishop die before the avoidance, the right of filling up the vacancies goes to his executors," &c. Cyclop. Art. Option.

† This was republished separately in 1798; it was also reprinted at New York in 1773.

‡ See Gibbon's "Mem. of Watts," 1780, P. 346. This letter, written in 1711, gives an interesting account of Mr. Jones's method of tuition. Among other means of improvement, the students were "obliged to rise at five of the clock every morning, and to speak *Latin* always, except when below stairs amongst the family." Dr. Kippis calls Mr. Jones "a man of uncommon abilities and knowledge," and commends his attention to the morals of his pupils and to their progress in literature." See his Lives of Bishop Butler, and Dr. Chandler, who were among Mr. J.'s students. Biog. Britt. 2d. ed. vol. iii. pp. 91 & 430.

|| See Lindsey's Apol. edit. 4th. pp. 2, 3, and Vindic. Priestcraft. pp. 51, 52.

in dutious silence. He began as Blackburne expresses it, to "take his repose on the bosom of an establishment," and became naturally jealous of all innovations*." The fate of the petition from the clergy is well known. The temporal agreed with the spiritual "governors of the church." Yet on discussing the merits of the petition from the dissenting ministers to the house of lords, for a similar relief, the great Chatham declared that in England we have "a Popish liturgy, a Calvinistic creed, and an Arminian clergy." A justly celebrated historian too, venting his spleen against Priestley, or rather against the reasonableness of Christianity, which Priestley inculcated, has the satisfaction of recording how "the doctrine of a protestant church is far removed from the knowledge or belief of its private members; and the forms of Orthodoxy, the articles of faith, are subscribed with a sigh or a smile by the modern clergy†."

Dr. P. next appeared as an advocate for the sacred observance of a long-neglected ceremony of the church: a project more grateful to his superiors than a proposal of relief from the burden of subscription. In 1776 he published "An earnest exhortation to the religious observance of Good-Friday; in a Letter to the Inhabitants of Lambeth Parish." He also interested the corporation of London on the subject. Success attended these pious efforts to restore a holiday on which toil-worn clerks and drudging appren-

tices may bless the memory of Porteus. Those also who refuse, in the absence of scriptural authority, to observe *days, months, and times*, will be thankful to our divine for having called forth "the History and Mystery of Good-Friday," from the pen of Robert Robinson. That writer bred, not in the church, but in the world, and who had trodden those walks of life from which fortune very early removed the Author of the "Exhortation," was best prepared to decide justly on the real influence of such ceremonial observances, the creatures of human contrivance, upon the virtue of individuals and the public good. "The History and Mystery" has passed through numerous editions, and will not probably be soon forgotten while what is complaisantly called "the religious observance of Good-Friday" shall be in fashion.

Our divine was now private chaplain to the queen, to whom his spiritual services became so acceptable that it was the determination of royalty to seat him on the episcopal bench, when a vacancy should occur. This happened in 1776, on the translation of Bishop Markham to the primacy of York: Dr. P. was appointed his successor in the diocese of Chester, retaining, except the rectory of Lambeth, his former preferments, including the mastership of St. Cross, that *option* of Secker to which he had now succeeded. The consecration of our prelate took place in Whitehall chapel, by the archbishop of

* Hist. View 2d. ed. p. 80.

† Gibbon's Rom. Emp. 8vo. 1791. x. p. 193, and note.

York, with the assistance of his suffragans, one of whom was Dr. Edmund Law, the venerable, but strangely inconsistent bishop of Carlisle. It was a remarkable scene, not to give it a worse name: we state the impression made on an intelligent orthodox friend who witnessed it, to behold an Unitarian prelate joining officially on such an occasion in the most solemn services of a trinitarian church. Surely while Christian churchmen must view such a scene "with a sigh or a smile," the unbeliever may be excused if he laugh outright.

During our prelate's primary visitation he was at Stockport in Cheshire. The learned Gilbert Wakefield then resided there as curate to the Rev. John Watson, at whose house the bishop was entertained. A conversation on the subject of theological lectures at Cambridge, which passed between his lordship and Wakefield, then a very young divine, is given by the latter in his memoirs (i. 183.) and is honourable to both the parties.

The Bishop, we believe, at a future period, made some provision for such lectures. At this time also he had the great merit of promoting another highly important object, by the encouragement of sunday-schools throughout his extensive diocese.

For this benevolent purpose he addressed a circular "Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester concerning Sunday-schools." In 1781 he published a "Brief confutation of the errors of the Church of Rome," extracted from the writings of Secker. Bishop Porteus had soon an opportunity of

doing honour to himself, by appearing among the advocates of the oppressed Africans. In 1783 he was appointed to preach before the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." The subject he chose, was a recommendation of "the civilization, improvement, and conversion of the Negro Slaves in the British Islands." This discourse was reprinted in a volume of the author's sermons, published this year, to which a second volume was added in 1794.

On the demise of the learned Bishop Lowth, in 1787, the royal favour was again displayed in the farther advancement of our prelate. He succeeded Lowth as bishop of London, provincial dean of Canterbury, and dean of the chapel royal. In 1790 he made the primary visitation of his diocese. The charge delivered on this occasion has been so much admired, especially on the subject of non-residence that we cannot forbear to extract the following passages.

"You will feel that the cure of a parish is a most serious and important trust, and that it is not without the most indispensable necessity to be devolved on any other but the incumbent himself. You will undoubtedly recollect, that when you are instituted to a benefice you do not say that you will execute the office by yourselves, or by your sufficient deputy: no, the bishop does in the most express terms commit to you, and to you only, the cure of the souls of that parish; and you must, in your own persons, be answerable for their salvation. Stewards, watchmen, shepherds, labourers; these and every other expression that implies *personal attention*, unremitting assiduity, vigilance, and fidelity, are applied to you in scripture. You are commanded before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, to be instant in season, and out of season, to reprove, rebuke, ex-

hort, with all long-suffering and doctrine; to watch in all things; to do the work of an evangelist, and make full proof of your ministry. And the ordination office enjoins that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty to bring all such as are, or shall be committed to your charge, unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and that ripeness, and perfectness of age in Christ; that there be no place left among you, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life.

These are all of them most evidently : *personal duties*; and it is to my conception utterly impossible for any man who seriously believes that he must give an account of his stewardship at the last day, to read such injunctions as these, and then render himself incapable of fulfilling them, by absenting himself from his cure, seeking amusement or employment elsewhere, and trusting to another for the discharge of duties which belong *solely and entirely* to himself*."

Thus awfully did our prelate describe the guilt of non-residence and *virtually* arraign his own previous conduct as a Christian minister. He had been through life a pluralist, holding preferments of which the *personal duties* were incompatible, satisfied to perform them by a "sufficient deputy." While bishop of Chester, an extensive charge, he had retained, with the mastership of St. Cross, his living in Kent, venturing to serve by deputy "the cure of the souls of that parish," and yet, according to the doctrine of the charge, "in his own person to be answerable for their salvation." We shall perhaps be *gravely* told that the Bishopric of Chester being comparatively poor, a living in *commendam* became necessary to support the dignity of its possessor, now Bishops are no longer tent-makers and fishermen, but on the

contrary, "religion erects her mitred head, in courts, and parliaments." Thus a prelate may recommend to his clergy a path which he had never trodden.

"And little *churchmen* must submit to fate,
That great ones may enjoy the world in state."

However inadequately our prelate had performed the "personal duties" of a parish priest, according to his own ideas of them, as a bishop he appeared to great advantage. Theology was with him an object of primary attention, and he was, what is perhaps not very common in our time, a preaching prelate. The character became attractive; the great and the gay crowded to the "Lectures on St. Mathew's Gospel," which the Bishop delivered in St. James's church every Friday, during the lent of 1798. These were afterwards published in 2 vols. 8vo. They contain no alarming novelties, nor have they been considered as adding any thing to our stock of biblical criticism, nor indeed to the reputation as a preacher, which the bishop by his two volumes of sermons had already acquired. The last of his publications appears to have been a small work, but of a highly practical tendency. It was entitled "The beneficial effects of Christianity on the temporal Concerns of Mankind, proved from History and Facts." The following passage from the introduction deserves to be transcribed. Whether there be any established church in Christendom which it does not unchristianize, let the reader determine.

"Whatever mischief persecution has done in the world (and it has, God knows! done full enough) it was not Christ, but some mistaken followers of Christ, that brought this sword upon earth; and it would be as injurious to ascribe to Christianity the false opinions and wrong practices of its disciples, however pernicious, as to impute to the physician the fatal mistakes of those who administered his medicines. The very best laws are liable to be misinterpreted and perverted. It was the fate of the evangelical law to be so. Its spirit was misunderstood, and its precepts misapplied by some of its avowed friends, and its authority made use of as a cloak for ambition, resentment, cruelty, and oppression, by some of its secret enemies. But the Gospel all the while was guiltless of this blood. It disclaimed and abhorred such unnatural supports, which it was as far from wanting as it was from prescribing. It authorized the use of no other means of conviction but gentleness and persuasion; and if any of its disciples, by a misguided zeal, have been betrayed into violent and sanguinary measures, the blame is all their own, and it is they must answer for it, not Jesus or his religion."

Had the public declaration of such sentiments as these been the last act of our prelate's episcopal life, his memory had been dear to liberal-minded and enlightened Christians. He lived, however, to appear in a very different character, and has been even accused of exhibiting that spirit of persecution which he had denounced as a mark of false religion, and an unjust imputation on the true. In 1808, the late Bishop of London, attended by his Dean, my Lord of Lincoln, an avowed impugner of the Athanasian Creed, suddenly presented himself in Doctor's Commons, to pronounce a sentence of deprivation on an aged clergyman, of approved learning and unblemished morals. By this act of power, which only the Bishop could perform, that clergyman, like his diocesan, as he

feelingly expresses it, "with one foot in the grave," was deprived of the income of his rectory, his sole dependence to cherish his "declining age," and to support a rising family. Such has been the sad result of this prosecution, from which the name of Porteus cannot now be separated. Yet it is but justice to inquire whether this act of severity, so painful in its consequence, were a voluntary infliction of punishment on an erring Christian brother, or an imperious duty which, however rigorous in the exercise, the Church had a right to claim from one of her governors, an appointed and richly remunerated guardian of her faith and order.

The Rev. Francis Stone had not only subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, but declared, like all other incumbents, on his induction, "that the book of Common Prayer, &c. containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God." He had, however, in the course of a studious life, entirely altered his sentiments, and at length felt it his duty to give the greatest possible publicity to his opinion, that the established creeds of his church contained the grossest fictions. Was his Bishop, in this case, to look only into the canons of the New Testament? His conduct would then certainly have been most amiable; but would he have acted a proper part as a guardian of the establishment? *Her* canons, while he chose to receive her wages, he was bound to enforce; and it must, we think, be granted, that the church as really tolerates a clergyman in declaring that Jesus Christ never "rose again," as that he was not "born of the Virgin Mary;" the

last sentiment may probably be a poetic fiction, the first, that Rock against which no power can prevail.

Appeals have been made upon this subject to the liberal scriptural sentiments expressed by various enlightened clergymen. These, however, must be rejected as incompetent witnesses, being themselves defaulters whose generous spirits were continually overleaping the narrow boundaries of "the church by law established."

It has been said, also, that the law of Elizabeth allows, but does not command, the bishop to deprive. We answer, that the constitution of the church demanded it, where the state had not "clipt the clergy's wings."

The haste with which the sentence was at last pronounced was almost indecent.* The Bishop might also, without making a very dangerous precedent, have followed a great example, mitigated the fall of his erring brother, and shewn that if his church possessed not the spirit of Christian love, he was not without it himself. When a clergyman, "for refusing to take the oaths to the government soon after the Revolution, had forfeited his prebend in the church of Sarum, Bishop Burnett, out of his own income, paid him the yearly value of it during his life."†

Bishop Porteus died after a few days illness, and was buried at Sundridge in Kent, a rural residence to which he was very partial, and where he had amply endowed a chapel. He has left

behind him a justly-acquired reputation for propriety of conduct, benevolence to his clergy, and attention to his episcopal duties. His name is enrolled among the firmest friends of the oppressed Africans. Perhaps he had more publicly advocated their cause, but for his early connection with a court which so long opposed the abolition of the slave-trade.

To the same cause, a disposition too desirous of royal approbation, must we, probably, attribute the conduct of this prelate in his legislative capacity. He sat for more than thirty years in the House of Peers. During those years there occurred discussions in which the interests of mankind were greatly concerned, and questions of war and peace were frequently determined. Yet during these years the Bishop was seldom, if ever, found among those who inquired if a proposed war were necessary, or whether peace could not be obtained. On the contrary, it has been said, we fear justly, that he was found "always voting with his Majesty's Ministers." Lords spiritual, when a peer is tried capitally, withdraw before sentence, among other reasons, because there is an ancient canon forbidding churchmen to decide "in a case of blood." Yet when a question of war is determined, in which thousands must be slain, they are, with very few exceptions, always found in ministerial majorities. This is surely to "strain out the gnat and swallow down the camel."

N. L. T.

* See on this subject various articles in the *M. Repos.* and *Crit. Rev.* XIV. 165--183.

† Burnett's Life, annexed to *O. T.* fol. ii. 723.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

ADVICE TO AN UNITARIAN PROSELYTIST.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

May, 1809.

I am an Unitarian, and make no scruple to avow myself a zealous party-man. Why should I be ashamed of being attached to a party, which I consider composed of the patrons of free inquiry, candour, benevolence and pure Christianity? I want to see our sect increase, our places of worship crowded, and our preachers held in general estimation. I should rejoice if the time were come in which Servetus, Socinus, Crellius, Biddle, Lardner, Priestley, Lindsey, and the other saints of our calendar, were held in similar veneration with Augustine, Calvin, Owen, Gill, Wesley and Whitfield.

To help forward this object, allow me through the medium of your respectable publication to address a few instructions to one of our Unitarian missionaries, whoever he may be, that shall happen to cast his eyes on them, and that may be on account of his character and disposition, a fit instrument for the purpose. To him then, I consider myself as speaking in the subsequent lines.—Sir, or if you are tenacious of the title, Rev. Sir,—I presume that you feel the strong impulse of the spirit of popularity, bearing you onward through every opposing barrier, in gaining accessions to our community; and that you have your ear open to any hints which the friends of our cause can suggest, in order that you may be competent to effect, what some of those wicked wights, the

Deists, have termed, “the raising of a religious mob.” I have not any thing to do with those cumbersome notions and repellent feelings which you may have acquired from rationality, propriety, the unostentatious nature of the pure religion of Christ, and from the well known fact, of its primitive advocates not being distinguished by any attempts to catch the buzz of popular applause.

I consider you as a man, and as having the general feelings of a man, and especially of those men, who in modern times and in our own country have figured as the only evangelicks, as the true gospel-preachers, whether as to their exterior they have had for their signatures the gown and the bands, or the apron and the hammer. You probably have neither abilities nor opportunity to acquire fame in the walks of literature; you have not sufficient courage to seek it at the cannon’s mouth in the field of battle: fear not, however; there is yet a path of fame open to you: seek it in being a popular preacher, and attracting round you the listening crowds.

Acquire as a primary requisite, a due degree of pertness and effrontery of countenance, together with a flexibility that can assume, as occasion may fit, the comic or the tragic cast. Deliver your discourses entirely extempore, and give hints that you are indebted for the matter of them to immediate suggestions from above. A persuasion of this kind will have a wonderful

effect in inclining the multitude to hear and regard our true and rational doctrines, since there are not scarcely any doctrines, however false and absurd in themselves, which may not make their way, when this necessary preparation has been made in the minds of the people.

You must always take care to keep up the attention of your auditory, by some quaint allusion, coarse similitude, or marvellous relation. Such things as these will be exceedingly grateful to many who may not be capable of understanding or relishing sound arguments, close reasoning, and the simplicity of a scriptural style. Subdue your hearers' prejudices by producing terror; threaten them with the most dreadful punishment in a future life if they do not believe all the articles of the Unitarian faith. You, in the bible, will certainly find more awful denunciations, against those who do not believe in the one and indivisible God, or who apostatize from the sole worship of him than can be found there against those who refuse to worship the triune God, or three persons in one essence, or who have conscientiously departed from that worship. In teaching men a way to heaven, that is without turnpikes, or without any demand of good works and pious exertions being made of them, you may not occupy the vantage ground with your orthodox competitors. To hardened sinners of all sorts, exceedingly consoling to be sure it is, to be assured with the energy and solemnity of a divine messenger, that Jesus Christ has *paid all*, and that his back has borne every burden.

Still it is practicable, with a

little management, to inculcate *Solifidianism*, or salvation by faith alone, with some plausibility and effect on the basis of any system of theology. You may comfort your hearers therefore by assuring them that if they stedfastly believe the Unitarian doctrines, whatever their temper or conduct may be, all will be well with them, since "he who believeth shall be saved."

You may be sure that one great cause of Unitarianism not being fashionable has been our ministers, "laying too much on the poor creature man," and enforcing perpetually the laws of christian virtue. It is absolutely necessary that you should exhibit our doctrines in such a form as to lead people to consider them, in all their minute particulars, as those solely that are connected with any hope of salvation. You must represent all other explications of the doctrines of the New Testament as doctrines of devils; the spawn of hell; as carnal reasonings and damnable heresies. How can it be expected that a body of people can be formed, or when formed held together, except it be by the cement of keen and strong faith, or believing the system of doctrine which they exclusively espouse as "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;" and that, moreover, they who maintain it, constitute the genuine church of Christ, and all who differ from them, and are not of them, belong to the synagogue of Satan. Insinuate in public and private, that those who do not embrace our tenets have corrupt hearts; that they are proud and conceited, setting up their own feeble reason against divine

authority; that they have no love to Jesus Christ, and are indifferent to the interests of serious piety; and that whilst the majority of them are licentious and worldly, the other part are careless and indeavour.

Sometimes perhaps it may be necessary to support your reputation for literature, especially in villages in which the parish school-master may have happened to learn the accident in his youth, sets up for a great scholar, and is considered by his neighbours as the literary oracle. Though you may not know much of Latin and less of Greek, you may pass the ordeal with safety if you speak Welsh. The impression you will thereby make on your hearers and even on the pedagogue himself, will be, from the guttural correspondence of the sound, that you quote out of the Hebrew Bible, and are deep in rabbinical learning. Fortunately, we have some missionaries who are Welshmen, and who are qualified to help an illiterate brother to a few convenient phrases.

The success of our cause depends not however entirely nor chiefly on your pulpit manners. You must cultivate in your style of behaviour the arts of popularity. With persons in all ranks of society you must make yourself familiar. You must never refuse an invitation to dine with any respectable and opulent family, and to make good use of the opportunity by playing off every manœuvre by which you may attach them to our party and cause. Insinuate yourself especially into the favour of the mistress and

other ladies of the family; they will be sure to recommend you to the other branch, and to all their acquaintance. as a man of experimental religion, as a sweet preacher, and one whom nobody can hear without deriving comfort or edification.

You may occasionally indeed step into the dwellings of the poor; there you may drop some pious hints and pray; but you need not make your visits either long or frequent; excusing yourself by pleading the multiplicity of your ministerial engagements.

Neglect not especially to visit persons on a sick bed, and who are supposed to be near death. If you can but inspire these with confidence of being happy in the future world, and incline them to express their confidence in most decided and absolute terms, whatever their previous course of life has been; you will have gained a grand point. However it may fare with the dead, you will have secured an interest in the living. The relations and friends of the deceased will consider you as a spiritual physician "of value," and will trumpet forth your praise.

I had many more suggestions to make on this fertile subject; but I shall defer communicating them till I know whether these prove acceptable to the description of persons to whom they are addressed, and that they have known how to make a proper use of them.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

SABRINUS.

MR. BRANSBY ON MILTON'S RELIGION.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Dudley, September
13, 1809.

SIR,

The "Admirer of Milton," (M. Repos. p. 432,) has failed to satisfy me that there is any "mistake or inadvertency" in the passage which gives occasion to his strictures. It is observed, by the writer of the discourse to which your correspondent alludes, that "some few instances may be adduced of christians of regular and serious deportment and irreproachable manners, who have lived without any visible signs of worship," and Milton is mentioned, in the note, as furnishing an example. The phrase "*visible signs of worship*" cannot surely, in reason, be considered as comprehending secret prayer. As far as relates to seasons of retirement, indeed, from the very nature of the case, all must be gratuitous supposition on one side and on the other. Whether Milton lived in the practice, or in the neglect, of social worship, is the only question, then, in the determination of which I am at present concerned. On this point, the testimony of his earliest and most authentic biographers is, I think, decisive. Toland, in particular, who has done ample justice to his subject in every other respect, and whose integrity, therefore, is not rashly to be impeached in this instance, affirms that Milton, in the latter period of his life, ceased to be a professed member of any sect of christians, frequenting no public worship and using no religious rites in his family.

It is worthy of notice, that the acute author of the "Remarks on Johnson's life of Milton," if we may judge even from the extracts of which the writer of the article in the Monthly Repository has availed himself, seems to have been convinced that Toland's statement is correct. That such was his conviction is indisputably evident from the following passages, which your correspondent, probably thinking them foreign to his purpose, has suppressed:

"If his studies and meditations were an habitual prayer, what occasion had he for a stated hour, which, being a circumstance in the *visible* worship of a private man, may as soon be a token of pharisaical ostentation, or popish superstition, as of cordial piety.

"Nor, perhaps, would Milton have accepted of Dr. Johnson's apology for his omission of family worship, or have acknowledged it to be a fault. Milton perhaps might think it sufficient to teach his family to pray for themselves; *every one as he or she should know the plague of his or her own heart.* Milton had doubtless known, by experience, how incongruous it was to trust his own prayers to the mouth of another man; and he might think it equally improper in him to dictate to the individuals of his family, prayers unsuitable, for aught he could know without auricular confession, to their several cases."

In a subsequent part of the same work, the author says, "For our parts, we are of opinion, that

Milton's sentiments, or the practical effects of them in matters of religion, want no vindication. As to the matter in question, we remember a passage in Robert Barclay's catechism, where the author, having cited several texts of scripture, concludes, *Ex omnibus hisce scripturæ locis apparet, verum Dei cultum in spiritu esse; et sicut nec certo cuilibet loco ita nec certo cuivis tempori limitatur.* This might be Milton's persuasion, as well as Barclay's; but no considerate man would conclude from these words, that Barclay never prayed in private."

The "Admirer of Milton" remarks, that "our great poet, who in his *Paradise Lost* has put into the mouths of our first parents so many admirable invocations and adorations, was of all, or most men, very unlikely to live in the habitual neglect of secret or family devotion." But this is a mode of reasoning which cannot be admitted. It would lead to very absurd and extravagant consequences. On the same principle, we might argue that Dryden, Smart and Burns were amongst the most devout and exemplary of mankind; whereas we know that each

of them was infamous for his vices.

I cannot conclude without observing that, if we admit—what, after all, I am not prepared to admit—that the peculiar circumstances in which Milton was placed, justified him in living without the visible signs of worship, "his studies and meditations being, in fact, an habitual prayer," it would, nevertheless, be unsafe in us, under the sanction of his example, to decline joining with our fellow christians and our families, in solemn addresses to the great Father of mercies. On beings like ourselves, the influence of social devotion cannot but be animating and happy. It is usual with those who deny the expediency and obligation of such worship, to vaunt themselves on superior strength of mind and accuracy of judgment. But are they entitled to their claims? Are they not either utterly unacquainted with the nature of the human mind, or lamentably regardless of human infirmities and wants?

I am, sir,

Yours respectfully,

J. H. BRANSBY.

REMARKS ON THE PROPOSAL OF AN UNITARIAN LITURGY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

London, September
19, 1809.

SIR,

I have read with attention the letter of your correspondent *Primitiveus* [p. 358] recommending the adoption of a liturgy in Unitarian societies, and as it is a subject which has been a good deal can-

vassed lately, I was in hopes that some one much more able than myself, but who, like myself, could not look upon the eligibility of an established form of prayer exactly in the same point of view as your correspondent, would have ere this replied to that gentleman's

letter, but as no one has hitherto done, may I take the liberty of making a few remarks upon the subject?

I trust that Primitivus will agree with me, that the grand point in question as respects the relative expediency of a liturgy or extempore prayer is this; which tends most in its effects to promote a devotional feeling in the mind of the worshipper, to interest and engage the heart, and to call forth those warm and lively emotions of gratitude, love and veneration towards the Supreme Being, which ought to accompany every act of homage paid to him; this, and not the propagation of any peculiar sentiments, I conceive to be the true end and intention of this most solemn branch of public worship. Upon this ground I think it will appear, that extemporaneous prayer, (if rationally, seriously and ably conducted,) or even forms prepared beforehand by the minister, are either of them preferable to a prescribed liturgy; and that too, in the first place, for the very reason which your correspondent thinks makes it "injurious to true devotion, and hostile to piety, at least to that of the poor;" I mean its variety, which I think both experience and reason prove to be productive of quite the contrary effect—congregations, like families, by being placed in different situations, are actuated by different feelings and sensible of different wants. Particular providences occur among them, and peculiar mercies are sometimes experienced collectively as well as individually, which call forth peculiar acknowledgements; and though there are points which are com-

mon to the services of all congregations, such as confessions of sin, petitions for pardon, professions of humble dependence upon, and confidence in the Almighty, thanksgivings for mercies experienced, &c. yet I think there is a certain strain of prayer, as well as of preaching, adapted to the peculiar situations, characters, and capacities of the individuals who compose his congregation, that an able and affectionate pastor will not fail to study and improve; to which may be added, the additional interest for their welfare, which such a study will produce in his own mind, and the effects which the demonstration of this tender concern will have upon theirs, thereby uniting each closer in those bands of mutual affection and regard, without which the pastoral office does not always tend much to edification, and which with our party, at least, the idea produced by the minister's merely mounting the pulpit to read the same things out of a book, over and over again, has often a tendency to lessen. This I think is not the least important light in which the subject ought to be viewed.

Dr. Paley, in his admirable work on the "Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy," alludes to the same subject, and makes nearly the same objection as Primitivus, observing that "the mind of the hearer is held in continued expectation, and detained from its proper business by the very novelty with which it is gratified;" but with all due deference to so highly respectable an authority, I would ask, does not this very expectation, by keeping the attention alive, confine the mind

to its proper business, instead of leading it from it; and is it not in consequence more likely to produce devotional feelings than the cold listlessness which a liturgy, when often repeated, is apt to produce?—"Joint prayer," he likewise observes, "is prayer in which all join." True; but this assent can be given by an instantaneous act of the mind equally well without a repetition of the voice; and it therefore by no means follows, according to the doctor's conclusion, that because "one alone in the congregation conceives and delivers it," that the rest should be merely hearers.—But to return to Primitivus: I cannot help wishing that he had advanced some of his reasons why variety in prayer (by which, by the way, I mean rational, serious, thoughtful prayer) is injurious to true devotion, and why to that of the poor in particular, as I cannot help thinking, on the contrary, that where the minister is left at liberty to adapt his services to the peculiar circumstances of his fellow-worshippers, he is more likely to engage the attention, interest the mind and warm the heart, than by the constant repetition of one and the same thing, however ably drawn up and carefully composed.

This leads me to another objection which has I think been fairly urged against a liturgy, viz. the weariness and inattention which the perpetual repetition of the same words produces, and which manifests itself in the careless, lifeless manner in which the congregation commonly takes its part in the service, making its responses generally merely through the medium of its organ, the clerk,

and which I think proves that the lively emotions which your correspondent alludes to are not so strongly produced by it as he seems to imagine; how different indeed is it, to where the minister, leading the devotions, thanksgivings, and requests of those committed to his charge, according to the various dispensations of Providence in regard to them, and thus, to use the apostle's expression, "continuing instant in prayer," preserves in their minds a lively and grateful sense of the Divine Presence in every passing event of human life, and constantly calls forth those sentiments of humble trust, confidence, resignation, penitence, love and joy, which, without such a stimulus, are too apt to flag and die away.

In respect to the remark which your correspondent makes, of the "introduction of a liturgy being likely to remove the scruples of many to join in our worship who are attached to set forms of prayer," I am fearful that it would be the means of many more leaving our societies, whose prejudices, if such they may be called, would be shocked by the change; whose early habits, mode of education, and ideas run quite counter to them; and I believe experience will bear me out in the assertion, that the experiment has seldom, if ever, been tried, without occasioning divisions and producing unpleasant consequences; and how far it would be expedient to run the almost certain risque of losing or paining many old and valuable members of our churches for the probable chance of obtaining a few fresh converts, whom the want of a liturgy is alone sufficient to keep away from us, I submit

to Primitivus's consideration. I would particularly urge this, if, as should appear by his letter, he wishes to make a liturgy the bond of union among us, which would of course in that case act as a kind of test, and be the means of separating all those from us who felt an objection to it.

I come now to another part of his letter, on which, though I have already trespassed too much upon you, I must beg permission to make an observation. He asks "whether it is not very desirable that we should at last be incorporated by common consent into a church?"—If, by this, he means such an union among our societies as would produce conferences, friendly associations, correspondences, quarterly meetings, both of the ministers and the laity, there could be no objection, and I most sincerely wish that things of this nature obtained more among us; and all this might be done without a liturgy, just as well as with one;—but, if by this incorporation he means the introduction of a form of church-government, which by the creation of fresh offices and functions amongst us, would destroy the present simplicity of our churches, and give an opportunity for the ambitious to aim at authority over us, I must most solemnly enter my protest against it. It would strike at the very root and prin-

ciples of our dissent, and would prove the introduction of infinite mischief. Emulations, strifes, jealousies, rivalships would creep in, and we should experience all the bad effects of a hierarchy, without any of its solid advantages. We want no Presbyterian bishops, we need not these changes to loosen and disunite us; for I am fearful we are already travelling the road to conformity both to the church and to the world much too fast, and rather need to be recalled to some of those good, old-fashioned principles for which our forefathers suffered so much. Let us then rather seek to distinguish ourselves by a recurrence to these sound, though slighted principles, by retreating from dissipation, frivolity and folly, and endeavouring to keep ourselves more "unspotted from the world." This would serve as our "avant courier" ten thousand times better than a liturgy. "Our cause" would then "have something palpable in it; its form might then be recognized, and would be admired by all who chose to contemplate it."

I have to ask pardon of yourself, of Primitivus, and of your readers, for taking up so much of your time, and remain, sir, with much esteem, a young man, but an

OLD-FASHIONED DISSENTER.

OBJECTIONS TO AN UNITARIAN LITURGY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, August 14, 1809. I hope, excuse me if I state some objections to the plan
Your correspondent PRIMITIVUS

he so warmly recommends, (M. Rep. for July), namely, the adoption of one common liturgy by all Unitarian Societies.

1. One great end proposed by this plan, "that the whole body might be, at the same instant, speaking to the Father of Mercies the same words," can never be attained, unless the public service could be performed in all Unitarian Societies at precisely the same time; which, neither the convenience of different societies, nor the unavoidable variations in our public time-keepers, will permit.

2. It is by no means certain, that all Unitarian Societies would consent to use any printed forms of prayer. There are many dissenters, who, though adopting the Unitarian system, yet have an invincible prejudice against a liturgy; so that an attempt to introduce one would probably occasion the division, and the ruin of many congregations.

3. Supposing that all of them were willing to unite in the use of a liturgy, still it is feared that a book, containing only two or three services, would really be injurious to true devotion. Does not experience shew, that a variety (at least, to a certain extent,) in the use of printed forms, is absolutely necessary to keep up the attention? In what religious society, in which one and the same form is constantly used from Lord's-day to Lord's-day, is there the smallest appearance of devotion? And, granting that "a public liturgy would very much facilitate the propagation of Unitarian sentiments, and would remove the scruples of many to join in our worship who are attached to forms of

prayer;" yet, would not this end of it be sufficiently answered, if at the same time the service-book contained such a number of forms as that no one need be often repeated?

4. Is the established liturgy by any means eligible in the view proposed? Is there not a want of method, and of proportion between its several parts, which the labours even of the late excellent and venerable Mr. Lindsey have not remedied? And if reference be made to any of the services, for the use of dissenters, which have been compiled from the established liturgy; will it not be evidently seen, that the authors of these compilations have laboured under great perplexity and embarrassment, owing to the very great scarcity of the materials they could collect from this source? and that such compiled services are not in any respect comparable to those which have been composed by Dissenters themselves? If Primitivus will attentively peruse a volume of forms for public worship, originally collected by a minister in the West of England, and since reprinted (with some judicious alterations) for the use of an Unitarian Society at Mansfield, he will perhaps see reason to acknowledge the justice of these queries. To the first eight services contained in that volume, there might easily be subjoined, from the devotional compositions of Dr. Leland, Dr. Priestley, Mr. Seougal, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Holland and others (with the addition of some sacramental services, and a few baptismal and funeral services) a number sufficient to prevent the danger there might otherwise be of an evil, of all the

most to be dreaded, namely, that the use of a printed liturgy would degenerate into a mere lip-service. And this, by the way, would most probably remove the great objection which many dissenters now entertain against the adoption of

a liturgy, and thus might facilitate the accomplishment of Primitivus's wish.

I remain, Mr. Editor,

Yours most truly,

J. T. E.

ON THE USE OF ORGANS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

Some of your correspondents may possibly be of opinion that the employment of an organ to assist psalmody, even though it should be played with real simplicity, is not consistent with the spiritual nature of christian wor-

ship. If, through the medium of your very useful publication, they would state the grounds of this opinion, they would oblige, among several others,

Yours, &c.

L. C.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE OF NECESSITY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

Observing the names of those who contribute to the Repository, and not being ignorant of the characters and opinions of many of them, I know no better source to apply to than yourself, in order to have a few difficulties cleared up respecting the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity. It is perfectly immaterial whether I profess myself a Libertarian or a Necessarian; consider me, if you please, the latter, at least one who admits most of the arguments in favour of necessity, but who is staggered when he traces the doctrine to its remote consequences.

As far as Mr. Hume reasons upon the subject, I am willing to coincide with him; but if I am obliged to be left in the state of doubt, difficulty, and uncertainty to which he consigns the conse-

quences of the doctrine, I cannot hesitate as a rational being and a Christian to withhold my assent from opinions, however plausible be the arguments in support of them, whose consequences are marked with so much imperfection.

Later writers upon the subject have indeed endeavoured to remove the difficulties in which Mr. Hume left the doctrine so overwhelmed, and in some respects have done it satisfactorily to my mind, but still some very formidable ones remain.

According to the Necessarian scheme, *self* is annihilated; the Deity is considered all in all,—the only mind that moves the vast fabric of creation, and the human race merely *instruments* which he employs in the accomplishment of some great designs,

As an artist employs various kinds of instruments, as hammers, files, &c. in the fabrication of some important work, as a watch for instance. We have no right, it is said, to inquire why the Deity acts in this mode, rather than in that; for his ways are inscrutable, beyond the span of human comprehension; and yet it is argued that the universal restitution of the human race is a *necessary* consequence of this system: for, that we have a *claim* upon the power which called us into existence, to make us eventually happy; and that it would be inconsistent with his moral perfections for any of his creatures to be eternally miserable.

That the wicked will hereafter undergo punishment is allowed by Necessarians, and is the undoubted declaration of scripture. But this punishment, it is said, is merely for the purpose of qualifying the sufferers to become partakers of a greater sum of happiness, and consequently is a kind, not an unjust provision of the Deity. Now if it be not unjust that temporary misery should be inflicted upon his creatures, what right have we to say that the Deity cannot consistently with his perfections, condemn some to eternal suffering. We see natural evil permitted in the world to a great degree, and we say that it is necessary in the constitution of the universe, and that it will be productive of good eventually; why may not then the perpetual misery of some, be a part of the great scheme which Omnipotence has in view in planning and regulating the universe, the result of which will be general good, though

brought about by partial evil? To contend that the perpetual unhappiness of some is inconsistent with the goodness of the Deity without proving (and I know not whence such proof can be adduced) that it is impossible that *good upon the whole* cannot be brought about by these means, is nothing but a *petitio principii*. Let us use the same argument when we talk about future misery, that we do when endeavouring to prove that present misery from natural evil is to answer wise purposes,—that our faculties are at present too limited to comprehend the operations of the Deity.

The only manner in which the use of prayer upon the system of necessity can be explained, at least as it appears to me, seems rather a singular one. We are informed that the Deity will hear our prayers, and answer them if reasonable. "Give us this day our daily bread" we are taught by Christ to pray. The Deity then who made us, chooses to bestow marks of kindness upon us, not *immediately*, but through the influence of our prayers. These supplications however do not arise according to the necessarian scheme, from beings who act at all from any independent will of their own, but are foreknown and predestined by the Being who chooses himself to be influenced by them: (for every act of a man, however trifling, is traced to the primary operation of the Deity; and this is liable to be lost sight of: my snuffing the candle upon my writing-table, is as much an object of prescience and predestination, as the dethronement of the Spanish monarch by Bonaparte.)

It is then, by this round-about mode that necessarians must suppose prayer to be heard and answered, (for we are assured that when reasonable and sincere it is effectual,) by the Deity: he knows certain things are necessary, or proper for us, but does not immediately bestow them, choosing to influence himself through the medium of our prayers to grant them. The fervent ejaculations for the remission of our sins: the solemn vows of future amendment: the pious aspirations for the welfare and happiness of ourselves and those who are dear to us: the humble strains of praise and adoration: the warm effusions of gratitude poured from the feeling heart for the blessings it enjoys: all, according to the principles of necessity, are supposed to be dictated to us by the Being to whom they are addressed!

But the most serious objection I have to offer, is the view in which moral evil is placed by the doctrine of necessity. As far as the *cause* of it is concerned, it is put upon the same footing as natural evil; both proceed from the Deity: and as to their *effects*, the one occasioning misery in this world and the other in the next, *both* are *appointed* from the foundation of the world for future, eventual good. How then is it possible to look upon an afflicted and a vicious man with different sentiments? The same Being that makes the one unhappy makes the other wicked; we must pity both; if we blame either we censure the appointments of Providence. What we feel for a vicious man, provided we are necessarians, we must feel for ourselves

when convinced of having acted wrongly; though sensible of the consequences of our conduct, we shall endeavour to look beyond them, and try to feel grateful that we are thought worthy to be instruments in the hands of Providence *for any purposes*, at least to be consistent with our principles, these ought to be our feelings on such an occasion, as much as in those instances referred to by Dr. Priestley.

That the Deity is the author of sin in *exactly the same manner* as he is the author of natural evil, cannot be denied upon the necessarian scheme; but both, it is maintained, are to answer the wisest ends. When he first created us, he foreknew whether we should be happy or unhappy, virtuous or vicious in this life, and what would be the consequences of our conduct in a future one. Knowing what parts we should have to act in the theatre of creation, when he called us into existence, he of course *determined* or *predestined* that we should perform them. All our actions consequently, whether virtuous or vicious, whether they promote our present happiness or misery, are appointed by him. How then can necessarians say that sin in his creatures is displeasing to their Creator? He cannot displease himself by his own appointments: at all events, if necessarians, we must conclude that the infliction of pain and misfortune in this life is in the proportion of its allotment as displeasing to the Creator as the infliction of misery, the consequence of sin, in a future state of existence. Scripture to be sure informs us explicitly

enough, that the Deity is displeased by sin, and that our powers are so many talents entrusted to our care, entirely at our own disposal, and independent of the appointment of any superior agent, and that we must be accountable for the manner in which they are employed; but the necessarian scheme refers us to another authority for the decision of this momentous question—the tribunal of human reasoning!!!

If these objections (which I believe have risen in the minds of wiser men than the writer of this letter) cannot be entirely cleared away from the doctrine of necessity, can any one dare say that they are only weak men and bigots who contend that a doctrine of this kind is improper to be held up for general belief?

Let us however for a moment suppose, and “to err is human,” that this doctrine is untrue. What will be the consequences? All those effects which naturally must arise from a system which so far countenances depravity as to assure the sinner that though he will eventually suffer, he is an instrument in the hands of an all wise and good Being, in bringing about universal good, and that instead of being ashamed of his conduct, he should rejoice in act-

ing any part in so vast and benevolent a scheme.

Too few, alas! already are the checks to wickedness in the world: too few already are the pangs of the wicked man in his career of iniquity, without having recourse to the doctrine of necessity to diminish those which may exist. It *ought* to be to no purpose to prove that the doctrine of liberty involves a contradiction and an absurdity, while the opposite doctrine is encumbered with a weight so burdensome to the thoughtful, feeling mind. The violent assertors of necessity may not be aware how apt the doctrine is, in minds less informed than their own, to undermine principles of far greater importance—the belief of a God, and the revelation of a future state. It would perhaps be more honourable to their talents and judgment, more creditable to their modesty and humility, to acknowledge, till every difficulty is cleared up, that it is a subject beyond the narrow boundary of our weak intellects, and that we must wait with patience for its elucidation, till the veil of eternity is withdrawn, and we rise endowed with more enlarged minds and brighter faculties.

I remain your's, &c.

E. N.

AUTHORS OF TWO ANONYMOUS TRACTS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

I have lately been reading with much pleasure a little duodecimo volume, entitled “Forms of Devotion for the Use of Families: with a Preface recommending the Practice of Family Religion, print-

ed for W. Johnston in Ludgate, street, and R. Griffiths in Pater, noster Row, London, 1758.” The work seems to have been the production of more persons than one. The authors were evidently Protestant Dissenters. They a-

now great liberality of sentiment. The Doxologies are on the low Arian scheme.

I shall be obliged to any of your correspondents who will inform me of the authors in question.

May I also inquire whether any thing be known concerning the following tract, which seems to have issued from the Unitarian school: "A Raitonal Catechism, or, An Instructive Conference between a Father and a Son. Licensed August 11th, 1687. London, printed and sold by Andrew Sowle, at the Crooked Billet in Holloway Lane, in Shoreditch, and at the Three Keys, in Nag's Head Court, in Grace Church-street, over against the Conduit, 1687." At the end is a poem,

entitled "Advice to a Son," of which the lines run lengthways from the bottom to the top of the page. The spelling is peculiar. The poetry is plainly the effusion of a scholar. The following is part of a description of Religion:

"Her School stands open. Hark! She bids us look,
"Whilst She unfolds her double Book,
"God's Word and Nature's Law."

The sum and substance of religion is thus stated:

"To God pay pure and humble Adoration.

"To Man bear Universal Lov.

"Let Reason in each breast rule ev'ry passion.

"Al Dutys on these Hinges move."

Hoping for a speedy notice of these inquiries,

I remain

Q.

MR. STONE'S ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION INCONCLUSIVE.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

I sympathize with Mr. Stone in his persecuted state, and rejoice in the extensive circulation of his sermon, as every new discussion of the subject must be of service to the cause. But I wish that he had not attempted to prove any thing, for which he has not the most solid support in the Scriptures. The humanity of Jesus is most clearly the doctrine of the New Testament, and whether the miraculous conception be true or false, he equally demands our reverence and obedience as a divine messenger. It is sufficient for us to know that he was a man approved of God by many miracles which God wrought by him, and by his resurrection from the dead,

and consequently that we also shall be raised, and that as he has taught us nothing but the will of God, our characters and our allotment, on the last day, must depend upon our compliance with the laws of his Gospel. We should not therefore step out of our way, to support any fanciful scheme of our own by irrelevant arguments. But, surely, neither the current opinion of friends, upon their first introduction to him, and when they were overwhelmed with wonder at his extraordinary wisdom, nor the sarcastic reflections of enemies, who laid hold of every floating circumstance which degraded him in their eyes, can determine whether he was the son of Joseph or not. If

the evangelists had asserted that he was, we should then have a good foundation to build upon. But what they report as the sayings of others proves nothing in this case. Mr. Stone, however, must confess that Philip only introduced his own opinion, without pretending to authenticate it by any sort of evidence, when he calls Jesus the son of Joseph. But when the Jews used the same language, and said, Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? they evidently spoke deridingly of him, whilst they were actuated with the most malignant hatred, and were ready to say and do any thing which they thought would render him contemptible to the multitude. Their mere opinion therefore goes for nothing, unless we think ourselves bound to adopt it upon other occasions, and to assert, because they said so, that he was an impostor, and that he cast out demons through Beelzebub the prince of demons. Hence it follows, that four out of the five passages which Mr. Stone has produced in support of his position are found wanting. The fifth passage he himself appears to think to be rather against him than for him. But he gets rid of the difficulty which embarrasses him here, in the words, *as was supposed*, by immediately deciding that the parenthesis was foisted into the text by some of the Platonic school. He should first have shewn that this parenthesis is not to be found in any of the best manuscripts, or that the testimony of the inimical Jews is preferable to that of Luke. But Mr. Stone further asserts "that

no intelligent creature can rank as a man, who is not the joint offspring of a man and a woman, and in the case of our Lord's birth, of man and his wife." According to this reasoning, Adam was not a man, as he had neither a man for his father nor a woman for his mother. For decency sake I pass over the comment upon Deuteronomy, 22, 23, 24, with only observing that the two cases alluded to are not parallel, and that God in his wisdom may supersede the intervention of man, and produce that by his power, of which he usually makes man the instrument.

To substantiate his assertion, then, that Jesus was really the son of Joseph, Mr. Stone must have recourse to more powerful arguments than those which he has already laid before his readers. He must not be satisfied with ridiculing what is called a dream or vision; nor with ridiculing what is called the fulfilment of a prophecy, when according to the language of the times nothing more was meant by this fulfilment than a mere allusion to the prophecy in question. Much less must he presume that he has established his doctrine, by saying, *having gained a complete triumph over an impostor who assumes the name of Matthew, &c.* But he must prove by substantial documents, that the two first chapters of Matthew and the two first chapters of Luke are palpable forgeries, that is, that they did not belong to the original copies of those Evangelists. But this he does not appear to have yet done. For that some of the contents of those chapters were not immedi-

ately blazed abroad in a wondering world, by those who paid no attention to the writers, nor to any of their doctrines, but would rather suppress every reference to them, is no proof of a forgery in this case. I do not say, however, with some whom I have heard discount upon the subject, that, if one man cuts off two chapters, and another two more, we may soon have nothing left. Let every interpolation be cut off, which can be proved to be such, and we shall lose nothing, but gain by it, as we shall still have the gospel, and have it in its most perfect state. But, let us reject nothing without the fullest evidence, after we have made the most impartial inquiry. And let us build nothing upon uncertainties, not introduce any dreams of our own whilst we are declaiming against dreams, nor contend about genealogies, whilst we are inveighing against those who have done so. The best method which preachers can take to promote the cause of Unitarianism, is to explain this doctrine fully as it lies before us in the Scriptures, without any bias upon our minds, and without adverting, except occasionally and in our own defence, to the monstrous systems of those who oppose themselves to it. Any difficulties which may arise in the mind of a hearer may be resolved privately, and any malicious attacks that are made upon us from the press may be answered from the press. This was the method which was adopted in America, by a gentleman who was more successful there than any other man in propagating the doctrine of the divine unity, Anti-satisfactionism, &c.

But whilst we pray to three or more Gods in the desk, we shall to very little purpose declare from the pulpit that there is only one God. I do not say that this is the practice of Mr. Stone, nor do I know that he is even present whilst the Trinitarian service is performing. But there have been such contradictory and inconsistent men. The late Rev. and ingenious Mr. Howlett, of Essex, whom I very well knew, was one of this number. He made no scruple to read the church service, though he believed no more in the Trinity than Mr. Stone or Mr. Evanson. He even laughed at the absurdity of the doctrine as much as any man. But he pretended that he only read the service as a herald does a proclamation, without having any other concern in the business than to read it. He would not therefore allow it to be said, when he read prayers, that he prayed himself; but only that he ran through an old foolish service, at the command of the governors of the church, in which he had no faith. But he would not inform the congregation, that they were not to consider him as a worshipper, until they saw him throw off his surplice. He would not follow the example of Dr. Sykes, who, when threatened with a prosecution by the bishop, unless he read the Athanasian Creed, prefaced the business with this notice, I am commanded to read a certain creed said to be written by a saint called Athanasius; but God forbid that it should be your creed or mine. He would not like him say, you must remember, my friends, that I do not believe in

this service, and that I do not wish any of you to believe in it. Indeed I cannot conceive how any Unitarian can stand up in his place as a worshipper, and be a leader in the common church service, and especially in that of the litany, without shuddering. In short, I would just as readily subscribe the 39 articles every day, as read that service every day. I would not however say, with Mr. Holden, that the reading of this and the having a deputy to do it, amounts exactly to the same thing. For the forbearing to read it is a kind of protest against the doctrines it contains, whilst the employing a deputy who has no objection to the service itself, appears to me to be in some measure different from outrageously insulting the Deity as the mouth of the congregation, and addressing him about his death and burial, agony and bloody sweat, baptism, fasting, temptation, &c. So thought the great Doctor Clarke and some others, whom I would not stigmatize as upon a level with those who are knowingly guilty of the grossest hypocrisy, though if I were circumstanced as they were, I could not consent to employ even a deputy, in carrying on the business in which I could by no means solemnly acquiesce. I would say to all Unitarians who frequent the Trinitarian temple, Come out from amongst them, and be ye separate, and be not ashamed of the religion of Christ; but honestly profess what you believe to be the truth, and make your light to shine, and I should think most meanly of those dastardly beings, who, when in the country, have not the courage to worship with a poor little flock; but to escape the sneer of the fashionable, and to see and be seen by them, run with the multitude to worship they know not what, whilst they may be sensible that this unprincipled practice renders them despicable, even to those with whom they associate.

W. H.

MR. MARSON ON THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

High Holborn, May 20,

SIR,

1809.

I have attended to the reasoning of your correspondent Mr. C.* in reply to my remarks on 2 Cor. viii. 9, and request your insertion of the following observations on it.

Your correspondent enters on his defence of Mr. Belsham by the following remark: "I have now before me his (Mr. Marsom's) 5th letter in which he, with much

surprise, animadverts upon Mr. Belsham's position, that the words of the apostle Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 9, express two states, not *successive* but *simultaneous*, not that Christ was first rich and after became poor, but that his riches were contemporary with his poverty." This is Mr. B.'s assertion; but assertion is not evidence, it is in itself a mere cypher, and the repetition of it by his defender will leave it a cypher still. Mr.

* See M. Rep. for April. P. 202.

B. rests the proof of the truth of the position entirely upon what he calls a *literal rendering* of the apostle's words, *i. e.* that "being rich, he led a life of poverty." I have shewn that no part of this rendering receives any countenance from the words in the original, and consequently that Mr. B.'s position is unfounded. His defender feeling, no doubt, as one would suppose every man must feel, that the original would not admit of such a rendering, has wisely avoided any reference to it, or to my remarks upon it, but contents himself with affirming that "it is *pretty certain* that the above declaration of Mr. B. is strictly the true construction of the passage."

Mr. Belsham affirms, that being rich means being possessed of miraculous powers; but, in proof of it, he has not made any reference to the Christian Scriptures, and of the impossibility of such proof, his defender seems to have been conscious, as he has neither cited nor attempted to defend that interpretation of the phrase.

This is all that your correspondent has said in defence of Mr. Belsham. His own observations on the passage in question, and what he has advanced to refute my interpretation of it, I now proceed to notice.

First he says, "Now as to the merits of the case, I must beg leave to observe, that it is possible for one to be rich and at the same time to be poor; and I must contend, that the apostle Paul in the words in question, means to say so much of Jesus Christ." He adds "I must beg further to contend, that to say so is *no contra-*

diction." What could give rise to this observation, but a conviction that it had, at least the appearance of a contradiction? And what man is there who would not *contend* that his statement does not contain in it its own refutation?

Hitherto we have no more than bare assertions, let us then see whether Mr. C.'s method of proving those assertions will carry us any further. He adds "For it is *only necessary* in order to shew the truth of this last position, to say, that it is possible for a person to possess the most ample means of gratifying his wants and his passions, and yet to forego the advantages he possesses." This is a most commodious method of proving a position. Does this assertion prove the preceding one to be no contradiction? Does it prove the meaning of the apostle in the passage in question, to be what he says it is? Does it say any thing but what is universally admitted, that a man may possess advantages which he does not improve?

Secondly your correspondent asks, "will any man deny that Daniel Dancer, of Harrow Weald, was *not* * poor in the midst of a great superabundance of means? and was therefore both poor and rich at the same time." I answer I deny it, and I believe that every man who reasons on the subject will do so too. Can any man suppose that Dan. Dancer thought himself poor, or would have admitted the suggestion while he was in possession of superabundant property? I observe further that so far is the miser from foregoing the *gratification* of his *passions* in denying himself the ad-

* The word not I suppose is a typographical error.

vantages which his riches would furnish, that he is thereby gratifying his most predominant passion, that of covetousness, in which all his other passions are absorbed; and therefore in that sense is not poor while he is rich.

What is all this to the present subject? Mr. Belsham states two cases, one of them similar to that of Daniel Dancer, which he says are strictly analogous to that of Jesus Christ; I showed that they were wholly irrelevant. Mr. C. brings forward the case of Dancer without paying any attention to the refutation it had already received. Your correspondent next appeals to the rendering of the passage in question by Dr. Hammond and Dr. Barrow. The former he says "goes rather farther than (he should have said contradicts) the common rendering, to prove the truth of Mr. B.'s construction;—he translates it, who being rich was for you a beggar." It is only necessary to say, with respect to Dr. Hammond, that this statement, if his annotations on the passage are referred to, is not true. He there says nothing like it. "Dr. Barrow," Mr. C. says, "has these words *δι' υμᾶς ἐπὶ πτωχεύετε* he was (as the apostle saith, 2 Cor. viii. 9) a beggar for us." Whether these are the words of Dr. Barrow or not is of little consequence; for were he and all the doctors in the world to affirm, that the Greek verb *ἐπὶ πτωχεύετε* means, and is properly rendered, a beggar, no one, who understands the language of the original, would believe them. That Jesus Christ was a beggar nowhere appears in the evangelical history; nor is there a circum-

stance in his life from which it can be inferred, excepting that of his asking a draught of water of the woman of Samaria. That Dr. Barrow (if those are really his words) paid little attention to the words of the original is very clear; for instead of rendering *δι' υμᾶς for you* which is their true rendering, he translates them *for us*, which certainly is not their meaning.

From these authorities your correspondent concludes, that the true rendering of the passage is not as they affirm, *being rich he was a beggar*; but *being rich he was poor*. I have before shewn, in my observations on Mr. Belsham, that the Greek participle *ὢν, being*, when used of one state in reference to another, (and especially where those states are opposed to each other) supposes that state to precede the other, and not to be simultaneous with it; this I confirmed by referring to a passage where the construction of the original is exactly the same as that of the passage in question (John ix. 25) and shewed that *Πλουσιος ὢν* may as necessarily mean that Jesus Christ was rich before he became poor, as *τυφλος ὢν* necessarily means, that the blindness of the man there spoken of preceded his receiving his sight. I will add to that another instance out of many that might be adduced, John xii. 17. "The people, therefore, that was with him, *ὁ ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ*, when he called Lazarus out of his grave and raised him from the dead bare record." Where *ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ* being with him, means, not being with him as they were then going up to Jerusalem, but being with him at the grave of Lazarus,

when he wrought the miracle of which they then bare record: and surely no one will contend that their being at the grave of Lazarus, and their being on the road to Jerusalem, bearing record of the miracle, were not successive but simultaneous, because the historian uses the participle *ὄν*?

I also observed that the verb *ἐπιωχέυσε* in this connection cannot be properly rendered *was poor*, and showed that Mr. B.'s rendering it *he led a life of poverty* is altogether foreign to its meaning. It is a verb in the active voice, and therefore cannot mean *he was poor*; but either *he became poor*, or *he impoverished himself*, and this is confirmed by the design of the passage which is to describe the active benevolence and kindness of Jesus Christ, in this circumstance. Ye know, says the apostle, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich, for your sake he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.

These arguments, with every other which I have made use of to refute Mr. Beisham's sense of the passage, Mr. C. passes over, and contents himself with affirming that sense to be the true one.

To illustrate the subject Mr. C. refers to the second verse, and affirms that there the apostle "describes them (the Macedonians) as *at the same time both rich and poor*." This is not true: he speaks indeed of their deep poverty, and of the *riches*, not of them, but of their liberality. This is not any thing like saying that they were *at the same time both rich and poor*; nor would there be

any more propriety in saying so of them, than of the poor widow who cast her mite, that is, all her living into the treasury.

He also asserts, that the apostle there makes use of the "very same Greek words" as in the 9th verse. But neither is this true. He does not there use the verb *ἐπιωχέω*, *poor*; (the word in the clause in dispute, ver. 9) but the noun *ἐπιωχία*, *poverty*; but suppose we might, with propriety infer from the words of the apostle, what nevertheless they do not express, that the Macedonians being poor, were at the same time *rich in liberality*, still it would not answer Mr. C.'s purpose; because the scriptures never speak of persons as being rich and poor at the same time, meaning thereby rich in one sense and poor in another, without, either explicitly, or by necessary implication, shewing in what sense the terms are used; as in this and the following instances; *rich in liberality—rich towards God—rich in faith—rich in good works*.—Poor of this world—*poor in spirit*, &c.; but nothing of this sort occurs in the passage in question.

I have now to notice your correspondent's misconstruction and perversion both of my words and meaning, in order to convict me of inconsistency and contradiction. This is the great burden of his piece, he begins with it, refers to it, and repeats it in different ways.

That the reader may see where the fallacy lies, I shall first put down my statement, and then the representation given of it by my opponent.

My words are,* "a rich man

* See Monthly Repository. V. iii. page 719.

may, at the same time, be a miserable man, *but he cannot while he is rich be poor.* The avaricious miser denies himself common necessities. True: but do his riches consist *in the possession or in the enjoyment* of his property? If in the *possession* of it; then while he *retains* the possession, whether he *enjoys* it or no, he will remain rich, and cannot be poor. If *in the enjoyment* of it, then while he denies himself common necessities, he is not rich, so THAT IN NEITHER CASE CAN HE BE RICH AND POOR AT THE SAME TIME." Your correspondent's representation is as follows; "So Mr. M.'s argument stands as follows:—a rich man, (that is, a man possessed of property), cannot while he is rich be poor; but

a rich man, (or *a man possessed of property*), may, *while he is rich be poor*; and thus, strange as it may appear, while he is in the act of endeavouring to prove that Mr. B.'s declaration involves a contradiction, he falls into a palpable contradiction himself."

By comparing the above passages, your readers will perceive that your correspondent makes me *assert* what I most expressly and positively *deny*.

The above is the only statement Mr. C. has made of any of my *arguments*, either in refutation of Mr. B.'s or in defence of my own sense of the passage in question. I remain

Yours, &c.

JOHN MARSON.

ON THE INCONSISTENCIES OF THE QUAKERS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, March 18, 1809.

Your correspondent, S. P.* in disputing the peculiarly distinguishing doctrine of the Quakers, ought to have taken a less exceptionable example than that of the man who, in his mistaken zeal, went to disturb Richard Baxter and his congregation. There are fanatics in every profession, whether civil, political, or religious, for whose extravagancies their sober and reasonable brethren can never pretend to be accountable. I do not expect that any one of that respectable fraternity will feel himself called upon to defend that doctrine, (the inward light,) which has been only sneeringly glanced at, without argument.

But there are such inconsistencies, amongst the modern Quakers, of departure from *some* of their ancient maxims, and of adherence to others, as would furnish a much better topic to expatiate upon, than the one above mentioned. Originally, they carried the maxim of not returning evil for evil to such a length, as not only to abstain from resenting injuries personally; but even from applying to our Courts of Law for protection from them, much less for the *punishment* of those who had been either guilty of abuse of their persons, or plunder of their properties. This, no doubt, was on the score of conscience; and on the same principle they claimed

* Monthly Repository. Vol. iii p. 475.

an exemption from contributing to the support of the ecclesiastical institutions of the country. They extended the maxim politically; no arms to be taken up in repelling the injustice of a foreign power upon the body politic, if he invaded you, whether for the purpose of conquering or exterminating you; no personal resistance to be made to him; all, all was peaceable acquiescence in the greatest atrocities, civil or political. It is true, if all mankind, both in their individual and collected capacity, acted upon this principle, there could be no such thing as oppression, no such a requisite as resistance; but as such is not the state of things at present, their maxims seem highly detrimental, not to say monstrous.

But what excites my astonishment is, that there seems to be a great degree of laxity crept in amongst them, respecting some of their maxims, deemed by them formerly of vital importance, whilst there is a pertinacity of adherence to others (in the eye of reason ridiculous, and even injurious), but which formed, at the period I allude to, no part of their discipline. I perceive now, that if a wealthy quaker is wronged or robbed of his property, one distinguishing principle of the sect vanishes like chaff before the wind—the not shedding of human blood;—he immediately advertises a reward for the man who will discover and convict the spoiler; and thus, like a carnally minded citizen, he immolates a wretched human being at the shrine of what he quaintly calls “the mammon of unrighteousness!” Here is a dereliction from ancient Quakerism; notwith-

standing which he is permitted to retain fellowship with his brethren. On the other hand, what shall we say to the modern custom of expelling a brother quaker for marrying out of the connection?

Though no Quaker myself, it is my felicity that I am acquainted with a family who are of that denomination of christians. I have for many years experienced their friendship; I have observed its constancy and strength towards others, whom they believe deserving of it; their love of liberty, of literature and science; their liberality in the cause of individual and general benevolence, and the constant propriety and gentleness of their manners;—qualities which so exalt christian domestic societies, that those of the mere world, whether high or low, sink into a contemptible insignificance by the comparison! One of this esteemed family married a worthy young lady of a different profession; I have often the pleasure of witnessing their mutual happiness; and *the Quaker was disowned*. If he had paid tythe to his parish priest he would have become liable to be disowned; and if, in the glorious preparations made in this country to give a proper reception to that man who is the terror of Europe, and the scourge of nations, he had also, with his friends and neighbours, buckled his sword upon his thigh, he would have been disowned. Now Sir, leaving the peculiarly peaceable opinions of the Quakers out of the question, I should like to be informed by some worthy individual of that persuasion, how it is that they can receive collections for the support of their poor, their schools, their meeting-

houses and their ministers, from the coffers where the price of blood, (as mentioned above) lieth also prepared to be doled out? And how they can retain fellowship with the masters of this so mixed a treasure, while my worthy friend, and others whom I know to be in the same predicament, are, for marrying the most worthy daughters of the land, or, in their own phrase, for having united in a mixed marriage, secluded from the sanctuary?

I would wish Sir, before I finish this letter, which perhaps you may already think too long, to make an observation or two more, namely, that as your valuable publication is the only one in England that is open to all parties for religious discussion, provided they enter into it, and continue their discussions with true christian charity: that as you stand so prominently forward, like a Christian Hercules, to encourage the weak and trembling inquirer after truth; to raise your voice and your shield in defence of such, against the insolent and overbearing attacks of theological calibans, I think it desirable that the candid and intelligent amongst the Quakers, would come forward and submit their distinguishing tenets to an impartial investigation, (for, to every judicious person, it certain-

ly must be a matter of no small interest, to know what are the peculiar views respecting the christian doctrine, of so orderly and highly respectable a body of christians as the Quakers), and if they can prove them to be founded on Revelation; to be consistent with the nature of man, in the different circumstances in which he may be placed; to be consistent with the eternal principles of Justice; and in one word, with the immutable and benevolent attributes of the Supreme Being; then we may reasonably prophecy, that sooner or later, all thinking men will become Quakers. But if, on the contrary, they adopt principles which can be proved to be at variance with the above standards of truth, or adopt others out of mere fanatical conceit, having no standards by which we may prove their truth or their falsehood, I have such an opinion of their integrity, as to believe that they would instantly abandon them, and embrace that system which requires only rational assent and reasonable service: these things, added to their other most excellent qualities, would render them the admiration of all those christians who love truth and walk in the path of righteousness.

I am, Sir, &c.

PHILO.

ORIGINAL LETTER OF THE REV. R. ROBINSON'S.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Headcorn, Oct. 4, 1808. R. Robinson, to the Rev. D. Taylor," recently inserted in your

SIR, 1808. valuable Miscellany, [Vol. iii. p. 315.] They will not, I am persuaded be less so by the perusal

Many of your readers were, I doubt not, highly gratified with the original letter from the Rev.

of the following from that celebrated advocate of religious freedom, which is likewise taken from the "General Baptist Repository." It appears from the initials of the name and other circumstances that it was addressed to the same gentleman as the former.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

J. E.

An original Letter from the late Rev. Mr. Robinson of Cambridge, to the Rev. D. T.

Charlerton, Dec. 24, 1787.

REV. SIR.

I am to thank you or Mr. Birley, or both, for your "Observations on Mr. Fuller's reply to Philanthropos." I admire the temper in which you conduct the controversy, and I do now most sincerely thank you for an example so edifying. It does me more good than all the arguments, however just and conclusive they may be.

This, however, is not the immediate business of this letter. The bearer, Mr. McIntosh, is a printer of good character, who is obliged to quit the University press, where he hath hitherto wrought, because the warehouse is overstocked with goods. He comes to town in search of work. Do you know friend Brown? or is the printer of the St. Ives Ordination Sermon a man who can help him? I only wish if you have any interest you would be so good as assist the worthy man.

Where I shall print I am not able yet to determine. Here I perceive I cannot. In town how is it possible without my personal attendance? and that cannot be! My labours have been suspended by a domestic loss; but I have resumed them; and I keep amending, transposing, adding, curtailing, and so on. I wish, if wishing be lawful, you were near: I should certainly consult you on the structure of some parts of the work, advantageously to myself and perchance not disagreeably to you. Is there any history of the English General Baptists? Are the modern generals descended from those at the reformation, whom the pretended orthodox persecuted, under the nickname of Free-willers? I never will call a persecutor, orthodox; he is heterodox in his morals,

and I regard him as a heretic of the most pernicious kind.

Do you ever visit old book-stalls? If you do, condescend to run your eye down the catalogue, and if you alight on the following books seize them for me.

Schyn. Herman. Plenior deductio hist. Mennoniter. Amstel. 1729.

Müntzers Thom. Protestation odder empietung seine lere betreffende. unnd tzum anfang von dem rechten christen glauber unnd der tawffe. quarto. 1524. No place.

Müntzers Thom. Behentuiis &c. quarto. 1525, without the place of printing.

I have Schyn's Hist. Mennonitar; but his Plenior Deductio I cannot get, and it is a different work. The two others I fear I shall not find. They are not in the library. Some time ago, I recollect, you asked me something about my notion of the innocence of error. I ever held what I now hold on that article, and I ever professed to hold it; but not as some divines in London are pleased to explain it for me. I met with a new book the other day, (by the way, I seldom leave off reading old writers now to look at any new books,) in which the author says, p. 47. "My hypothesis here is, that no man is to blame for what he could never possibly avoid." Lo! the whole secret of innocent error! The difference between me and my objectors is,—They determine this possibility for every individual, judge for each, and hold all guilty who are not believers of what they pronounce to be true. I leave this judgment to the Lord, and hold men guilty in regard to me, only for actions overt and accountable to me. Trace you this axiom, and you will find it scents of human blood; and follow the history of it, and you will find the standard of the true is the opinion of the majority; and of course the poor anabaptists, always in a minority, are in some of the rooms of the inquisition, preparing for the fire to which they are condemned, not for immorality, but for holding error. Do not, my dear Mr. T, imagine I am courting a dispute. Pray don't answer me, think what you will; for my respect for you will force me to write, and my sense of duty to my history will forbid it: and so between both I shall be in an uneasy case. Have you seen a little piece of

Dr. Arthur Ashley Sykes, that finest of all fine reasoners, on the innocence of error? I am told it is sold at Johnson's, in St. Paul's Church Yard. I have never seen it, but I so esteem the author.

December 25.

I was interrupted here yesterday, first by company, and then by embracing the moment before the library was shut for the holidays, of an opportunity of looking out a lot of books for my amusement during the time. I could not resist the temptation, and a fine parcel of scarce and invaluable old pieces I have got. Among others here is "The Obedience of a Chrysten Man, by W. Tynedale.—Prynted at Malborawe in the lande of Hesse, by Hans Luft. The viii day of Maye. Anno. MDVIII." Remark this one sentence, folio lxxvi. "Baptysm. The *plungynge* into the water signifieth that we dye, and are buryed with Chryst as concernyngethe olde lyfe of synne which is Adam. And the *pullynge out agayn* signifieth that we rise agayne with Christe in a newe lyfe." This is one of the many proofs beyond all contradiction which I have of the fact, that immersion in ordinary baptism was the invariable practice of the English till the Reformation. This is dated 1528, and by the man who translated the Bible. I have now received thirty-four volumes. Several are old farthing tracts, and one hath forty-seven of these jewels in it.—I was speaking of Sykes. I think him an incomparable writer, and therefore I *suppose* his piece on the innocence of error is excellent; but I do not affirm that it is, for I never saw it: This writer, and numbers more, the first in learning, piety and critical taste, lie wholly unknown to most of our ministers. Why? They have mistaken their true and real characters, and instead of considering themselves disciples of truth, set up for defenders of faith. Hence it is, you may ride a black horse white among that class of men, and not find a single critic. I do not call a snarling pick thank a critic. I call him so who hath the talents and the temper which constitute critical abilities. One is not a critic: he hath no brains. Another is not: he is too idle, he will not labour. A third is not: he is too poor, he cannot procure books and tutors. Another durst not be one: he is so afraid of his reputation. A very great fund of both folly and vice is at the bot-

tom of all such cases, except the first; for if a man have no natural talents, if he be nothing but a bundle of sheer boobyism, blubber for orthodoxy he may; but criticise a sentence he cannot; and if his temper were as soft as his brain, I should hold him innocent.

It is the critical study of the New Testament, not of single words and phrases, but of the whole, in connection with geography, chronology, eastern customs, languages, &c. that I think is the peculiar business of a disciple of truth. It is easy to make of boys defenders of faith. It is not easy to make even men sound critics. A man who affixes guilt to any mode of thinking, must not so much as suspect some popular notions which are called fundamental to be false, or only true in part. He must not even be known to buy or read heretical books. He must never examine more than one side; that is to say, he must renounce all pretensions to that perfect liberty in which his Lord placed him by his gospel, and he must declare for some species of tyranny. You hold *general* redemption: another *particular*: you hold one another guilty: so you begin in coolness and end in enmity. I hold you both innocent in regard to me, as long as you differ only in thinking of this subject, and whether either of you be guilty, or which of the two, or in what degree, I leave to the great Judge to determine. Both innocent in my eye, I admit you to all Christian privileges, baptism, the Lord's supper, the alms, and the offices of the church. The moment you break the King's peace, by any unjust action one to the other on account of your different sentiments, I hold you both guilty, not of believing error, but of overt acts which disturb society. A man the other day, a man of God too, and, more than either, a Londoner, wrote us word he was not sure he understood Robinson's notion of the innocence of error, but he and his brethren condemned it. Now is not this abominable, Friend T? This genius doubted whether he understood what he had heard of, but he did not hesitate to censure it! I beg your pardon for scribbling on at this rate. It snows very fast. I query whether I have any company to day. It is a popish festival; but I being a protestant leave the pope to countenance his own frenzies. I will not disgrace myself by stooping to preach to them, who

would not hear if they had any thing else to do. However, I do not mean to persecute you all day by writing. As to what I have written, pray don't answer till you do so in this room, and then I should think a week well spent in proving, that when a man doth not affix immoral consequences to his modes of thinking, he ought by us to be held innocent, think what he will. Last week I had the happiness of seeing six of my children received on their own profession of faith into this church. I baptized them not in the church baptistery; but in my family bath at the bottom of my garden; for I had a mind to try the primitive eastern mode of im-

mersing. I led one down the steps, turned her about and set her face toward the steps, placed myself on her left side transversely, and putting my right hand on the back of her head, bowed her forward into the water, and effected a perfect immersion, while I pronounced the baptismal words. We are all so satisfied with this mode, (for the rest followed the first, one ascending, another descending,) that I think I shall never use any other in future.

I will trouble you no longer. Every benediction be with you.

Your's, ever,

R. ROBINSON.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

FURTHER VINDICATION OF THE TRUE MEANING OF JOHN VI. 27.

I shall not admit that Mr. Jones has established his interpretation of the last clause of John vi. 27, until he proves that the custom to which he refers, existed in Judæa: hitherto I have been unable to discover traces of it, either in those of the Mosaic books which treat of sacrifices, or in any of the writers on Jewish antiquities.

Possibly "the learning" of some of Mr. J's "readers" can "supply" the requisite authori-

ties: for such a communication I shall be very grateful; and it would not, I presume, be displeasing to Mr. J.

I shall only add, that the interpretation for which I plead, of the passage in question, approved itself to my mind many years before I knew that it was adopted by Mr. Kenrick, and may be found in Bishop Pearce's Commentary, in Schleusner's Lexicon, and I doubt not in other authors. *Augt. 25th 1809.* N.

COLOSS. IV. 10.

In Coloss. iv. 10, St. Paul has these words, "Salute Aristarchus—and Mark, and Jesus called Justus, who are of the circumcision (i. e. who are of Jewish extraction) *οἱ οὗτοι ἐκ περιτομῆς*—Luke the beloved physician and Demas salute you." On these words Michaelis remarks, Introd. vol.

iii. 228. "Here the Apostle distinguishes Aristarchus, Marcus, and Jesus the Just from Epaphras, and Lucas and Demas, saying expressly of the three first, that they were of the circumcision: we may conclude therefore that the three last were not of the circumcision." This conclusion,

if just, would, it appears to me, materially affect the credibility of Luke's gospel, and it is therefore of some consequence to shew the fallacy of it. The participle *εἶπες* implies something real in opposition to, or in contradistinction of a name, or an opinion or an appearance, expressed or implied in the context. Aristarchus, Marcus and Justus were Greek and Latin names, and the Colossians might hence have concluded that they were Gentiles by birth; and to prevent this inference the apostle in effect says, that though they were thus named they were in reality Jews. We are therefore to understand him not as intimating that Luke was not a Jew, but that those men were Jews notwithstanding that their names intimated the contrary: Michaelis, indeed, betrays an uncommon want of critical sagacity on this occasion; nor has Lardner, who reasons against this conclusion, detected its fallacy. See his works. vi. 118.

I will here add another instance of far greater consequence in which the Christian world have hitherto consented to be duped by the grossest fraud. The story of the miraculous birth of our Lord appears to me, not only not sanctioned by the genuine writings of the evangelists, but to be contradicted in the most direct terms, it being taught by certain false teachers long before the memoirs of Jesus were published. Luke, in the beginning of his gospel, adverts to those teachers, and he intimates that his object in composing it, was to give Theophilus an authentic narrative of the truth, that is, to prevent him from being deceived by cunningly devised

fables. In the number of these was the doctrine that our blessed Lord was miraculously conceived, i. e. was not the real son of Joseph. Hear then what this historian says on the subject. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡς εἰς ἐπὶ τριακοντὰ ἀρχόμενος, ὡν ὡς ἐνομίζετο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ. iii. 23. "And Jesus himself was about beginning his thirtieth year, being (ὡν being in reality) as he was supposed to be, the son of Joseph." Here the evangelist says that Jesus was supposed to be the son of Joseph, and he presently tells you by whom—by the inhabitants of Nazareth, among whom he and his parents had lived thirty years, and whom he represents as bearing this testimony to him as the son of Joseph. iv. 22. In the next place, St. Luke tells us that Jesus was in reality what he was thought to be, the son of Joseph, thus confirming the common opinion by his own declaration. Had he thought otherwise, or had he been the author of the two preceding chapters, he would have asserted quite the reverse, and his language would have been *μη ὡν οἷς ἐνομίζετο*, being NOT in reality as he was supposed to be, the son of Joseph. Here *ὡν* is opposed to *ἐνομίζετο* and confirms its meaning, by asserting that as a fact which was entertained in opinion. In chapter iv. 16. the historian says that Jesus was brought up at Nazareth *ἢ ἤν τε θρεψόμενος* where he was educated. But the term *τρεφω* is taken from an Arabic word *ترب* *terb* or *treb*, which signifies to spring from the ground, and means often in Greek writers, agreeably to its original signification, to be *born*, thus completely answering to our phrase

to be born and bred. Thus Sophocles intimating that the murderer of Laius was a native as well as an inhabitant of Thebes, describes him *τεθραμμενον εν τηδε παλει*. Cf. Tyr. 97. and this language he accurately defines by opposing it to *αλλων εξ αλλης χθονος*, line 238. So also Homer, II. i. 251, intimates that the associates of Nestor were native Pylians, when he thus describes them *οι τραπεν ηδ' εγενοντο εν*

Πυλω ηγαθη. I am not disposed to lay much stress on critical refinements, in support of a doctrinal point of great moment; but I feel fully convinced, that the sacred writer, unless he intended to inculcate that Jesus was a native of Nazareth, would not have used a word which implied that fact, without guarding against it by the use of some other term.

THEOLOGUS.

TABLE OF PASSAGES in which the Improved Version leaves the Text of Griesbach's 2nd edition; together with those in which it leaves the Received Text without sufficient notice: continued from p. 388—390.

N. B. For an explanation of the marks, see p. 388. The manuscript marks not being fully understood, the force of —, denoting somewhat probable omission, is in some passages left ambiguous. To remove the ambiguity a bracket will be inserted where the force of — ends; and the reader is requested to insert it with the pen, after the following words in the citations to which G. is prefixed. Matt. i. 12. *bis*. x. 8. *dead*. xxi. 12. *God*. xxiii. 4. *borne*. xxvi. 3. *scribes*. Mark i. 13. *desert*. v. 13. *Jesus*. — In Mark iii. 7. the — before *followed* is erroneously inserted.

MARK continued.

- Ch. vi. 2. and *whence* are such mighty works. R. T. that even such mighty works are.
 — 15. And others. R. T. others. G. prefixes *to and only*. A. 3. See note on Matt. xxvi. 38.
 — 16. *It is* [John] R. T. It is John.
 — 33. And *the multitudes*. R. T. And the multitudes. — many knew him. G. many knew *him*. — G. prefixes *to and came in the last clause of the verse, only* A. 3.
 — 34. And Jesus G. *rej.* Jesus.
 — 36. buy for themselves [bread: for they have nothing to eat] G. retains the reading of R. T. without any mark of omission; but in the margin places what they may eat as probably preferable to the clause in brackets.
 — 44. were five. R. T. were about five.

- 51. [greatly] G. — greatly [beyond measure and wondered] G. — beyond measure [and wondered].
 vii. 5. defiled. R. T. unwashed.
 viii. 1. Jesus called. G. *rej.* Jesus.
 — 31. and chief-priests and scribes. G. inserts the *in both cases with* A. 2.
 — 35. he shall save it. G. *rej.* he.
 ix. 7. cloud, This. R. T. cloud, saying, This.
 — 23. If thou canst? All. G. If thou canst [believe], all.
 — 26. convulsed [him] G. *rej.* him.
 — 33. among yourselves. G. [among yourselves].
 — 38. forbad him. G. forbad him. [because he followed not us]. Neither here nor in vs. 23. is the departure from R. T. noticed.
 — 43. [into the unquenchable fire]. G. only prefixes —; which he also prefixes to vs. 44-46.

- Mar. i. 14. [and] G. *rej.* and
 — 28. Peter. R. T. And Peter.
 — 29. Jesus. R. T. But Jesus.
 — and for the sake of the
 gospel. R. T. and the
 gospels. G. *adds* for the
 sake *with* A. 1.
 — 40. on my left hand. R. T. on
 my left hand.
 xi. 3. will send. G. *sendeth: and*
points so as to make this
clause a part of the message,
and immediately sendeth
it back hither.
 — 10. [in the name of the Lord]
 G. *rej. these words.*
 — 14. And Jesus. R. T. And Jesus.
 — 15. and Jesus. G. *rej.* Jesus.
 xii. 4. at him they cast stones and
 wounded *him* in the head.
 G. and [casting stones]
 they wounded him in the
 head.
 — 20. Now there were. G. Now
 there were.
 — 23. When therefore they shall
 rise again. G. [When —
 again]
 — 27. but of the living. R. T. but
 the God of the living.
 — 32. there is one God. G. there
 is one. *or* he is one.
 xiii. 11. nor meditate. G. [nor medi-
 tate]
 — 18. your flight. G. [your flight]
 — 32. or hour. R. T. and hour.
 xiv. 5. For this ointment. R. T. for
it. G. *prefixes* A. 2. *to* this
 ointment.
 — 15. furnished. G. furnished —
 ready]
 — 20. [answered and]. G. *prefixes*
 —
 — 40. sleeping again. G. sleeping
 [again]
 — 43. who was. G. [who was]
 xv. 31. In. R. T. And in.
 xvi. 8. went out. R. T. went out
 quickly.
 LUKE.
 i. 9. And she was much troubled.
 R. T. And seeing *him* she
 was much troubled at his
 saying. G. And she was
 much troubled at this say-
 ing.
 — 75. all our days. R. T. all the
 days of our life.
 ii. 33. his father and mother. R. T.
 Joseph and his mother.
 — 45. found *him*. G. *rej.* him.

- Lu. iii. 2. Annas and Caiaphas being
 high-priests. G. under
 the high-priests Annas
 and Caiaphas.
 v. 20. he said. R. T. he said to *him*.
 vi. 7. watched him G. *rej.* him.
 — 26. Alas *for you* when men. R. T.
 Alas for you when all men.
 — 28. and pray. G. *rej.* and.
 — 45. an evil [man]
 vii. 28. [prophet] G. — prophet]
 — 44. her hair. R. T. the hair of her
 head.
 — 45. she entered. G. I entered.
 viii. 9. [saying] G. — saying].
 — 21. do it. R. T. do it. *With Gries-*
bach's reading the clause
would be better rendered,
who hear and do the word
of God.
 — 34. and told. R. T. and departing
 told.
 — 36. he had been cured. G. [the
 demoniac] had been cured.
 ix. 1. the twelve apostles. R. T. his
 twelve disciples.
 — 3. staves. G. staff.
 — 23. his cross. G. his cross [daily]
 — 25. [or forfeit] G. or forfeit.
 — 56. and rebuked them. G. and
 rebuked [and said, ye
 know not what spirit ye
 are of]. *The reading of the*
R. T. is subjoined, but R. T.
is not prefixed to it.
 x. 6. If *the*. R. T. if *the*.
 — 20. rejoice that. R. T. rejoice
 rather that.
 — 21. sight. R. T. sight. And turn-
 ing to his disciples he said.
 — 37. Then. G. — And].
 xi. 28. keep it. R. T. keep it.
 — 34. is thine eye. G. *adds* thine
with A. 3.
 — 48. [their] sepulchres. G. [their
 sepulchres].
 — 53. *Here is a various reading agree-*
ably to which, while he said
 these things unto them,
should be in brackets.
 — 54. laying wait for him. G. [lay-
 ing wait for him].
 and seeking. R. T. and seek-
 ing. G. [seeking].
 xiv. 5. and spake unto them and said.
 G. and [answering] said
 unto them.
 xv. 17. perish here with. R. T. perish
 with. G. *adds.* here *with*
 A. 2.
 — 19. I am. R. T. And I am.

- Lu. xv. 22. Bring forth quickly. G. and Jno. iv. 31. In the. R. T. Now in the R. T. Bring forth. *Similar minute omissions are observable in vi. 24.*
- xvi. 15. is abomination. G. *rej.* is. R. T. they also took. 43.
- xvii. 3. Now. G. [Now] R. T. Jesus therefore. 45.
- 4. turn again. R. T. turn again to thee. R. T. Every one therefore. 68.
- 9. commanded him. R. T. commanded him. R. T. Peter therefore. vii. 9. R. T. And when. 12. R. T. and others. viii. 42. R. T. Jesus therefore. 46. R. T. And if. 48. R. T. The Jews therefore.
- 24. Son of man be. R. T. Son of man also be.
- xix. 42. [thy] G. — thy].
- xx. 9. A man. R. T. A certain man.
- 13. reverence him, when they see him. G. reverence him [when they see him].
- 23. Why do ye try me. G. [Why do ye try me].
- xxii. 45. to his disciples. G. *rej.* his.
- 57. denied him. G. denied [him].
- xxiii. 62. Peter went out. R. T. Peter went out.
- xxiii. 25. released unto them. G. *rej.* unto them.
- 54. and the sabbath. G. [and] the sabbath.
- xxiv. 36. Jesus himself. R. T. Jesus himself.
- 49. in the city of Jerusalem. R. T. in the city of Jerusalem.

JOHN.

- i. 13. [nor of the will of man]. G. *without any mark of omission.*
- i. 14. 16. 17. 18. 15. G. 14. 15. &c.
- 29. John. R. T. John.
- 39. now. R. T. now. *Similar minute omissions are observable in i. 41. the. i. 43. Jesus iii. 2. Jesus. iv. 36. And. v. 46. Jesus. vii. 8. now. vii. 29. But. viii. 20. Jesus. ix. 23. Then.*
- iii. 13. [who is in heaven]. G. — who is in heaven].
- v. 5. thirty and eight. R. T. thirty-eight. R. T. G. *adds and with A 1.*
- vi. 2. the miracles. R. T. his miracles.
- 35. And Jesus. G. [And] Jesus.
- 39. of him who. R. T. of the Father who.
- 58. [manna]. G. *rej.* manna.
- vii. 8. this feast. G. [this] feast.
- 33. said. R. T. said to them.
- viii. 41. Others said. G. [But] others said.
- 46. Never man spake like this [man]. G. Never man spake thus — as this man].
- viii. 14. and whither (the latter). G. or whither.
- 21. Jesus. G. [Jesus].
- 29. the Father. G. [the Father].
- 34. of sin. G. [of sin].
- ix. 13. [him, I say, who had been blind] G. *prefixes no mark of omission.*
- 18. [the parents I say of him that had received his sight]. G. *prefixes — to these words.*
- 36. Who. G. *inserts And with A 1.*
- 37. And Jesus. G. [And] Jesus.
- 40. And G. [And].
- 41. Therefore. G. [therefore].

(To be concluded in our next.)

REVIEW.

"STILL PLEAS'D TO PRAISE, YET NOT AFRAID TO BLAME."

POPE,

ART. I. EIPHNIKON. *A Sermon, preached in Holy Trinity Church, Kingston-upon-Hull, on Tuesday, July 25, 1809, at the Primary Visitation of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edward Lord Archbishop of York; By the Rev. J. H. Bromby, M. A. Vicar of the said Church, and late Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.* 4to. pp. 28. Rodford, Hull; Johnson, London.

The title of this discourse "was suggested by that of a well-known work of Bishop Stillingfleet's, of great learning and moderation, written with the design, as he himself affirms, of accomodating the differences subsisting in his day, and of laying a foundation for the church's peace." [Dedication, p. iii.] The catholic spirit and the good sense which pervade the discourse, justify the adoption of this title.

Mr. Bromby is at once an advocate for peace and charity, and for the church of England. As an apologist of the national establishment, he has said nothing,

we conceive, that has not been again and again refuted, and the very conclusion of his discourse, in which he pleads for a further reformation of the church, furnishes a good ground of dissent; but he reasons so dispassionately, and treats non-conformists so courteously, that we feel much more inclination to praise his general design, than to object to any particular arguments, by which he has endeavoured to promote it. It is in itself no small honour, in a clergyman, to speak of schism without losing his temper, and to allow learning, sense, integrity and piety to Dissenters.

ART. II. *Modern Orthodoxy identified with Antichrist.* *A discourse delivered on the 22d June, 1809, at a Meeting of Ministers assembled at Boston, and published at their united Request. By John Grundy.* 8vo. pp. 26. Robinson, Nottingham; and D. Eaton, London.

After quoting from Dr. Benson, his enumeration of the applications made by commentators of the man of sin and of Antichrist, and enumerating all the passages of scripture which relate to this subject, the preacher remarks that "the term Antichrist refers not to persons, but to principles,"—that "the term is applied to persons who professed to be believers in christianity," not to its "external foes"—and that "this adulteration, which is Antichrist, began to take place during the life of John." As the Gnostics were the principal sect which made such early encroachment upon the doctrines of the apostles, the author from the ecclesiastical his-

stories of Fleury, Mosheim and Priestley, points out some of the principal articles of their creed. This statement leads him to identify modern orthodoxy with Antichrist. Of the Gnostics it may be said, that the name they assume manifests presumption, that their system was founded, not upon plain narration and historical fact, but upon allegorical construction and mystical representation. Amongst their notions the following were favourite opinions, that the world was not created by God himself, but by some inferior agent; that there is a malignant being who controuls the operations of the Almighty, that human nature is depraved from the necessary corruption of every thing material; that the soul is a distinct, immaterial, naturally immortal substance, and that the man Jesus was not the Christ. With considerable ability the striking resemblance between these primitive errors and modern orthodoxy is pointed out; and the whole sermon is a spirited and well-conducted attack upon the corruptions, which commenced so early, and with increasing aggravation have continued so long in the Christian church. We join sincerely in the prayer with which the sermon is concluded.

"May the man of sin be hurled from his throne, and Christianity, pure and unadulterated, resume her proper seat, and with the sceptre of love and peace, rule every nation of the world." P.

ART. III. *The Innocency of Involuntary Error asserted and vindicated. In a letter to ————. By Arthur Ashley Sykes, D. D. Formerly Rector of Rayleigh, Essex. 4th. ed. 12mo. pp. 50. 1s. Eaton, London.*

We are heartily glad to see a new edition of this invaluable little piece, which has long been no otherwise procurable than in volumes of Tracts. It exposes the futility of the arguments adduced for the orthodox tenet of *the sin of thinking*, as well as the mischievous consequences of this fanatical notion to the church, and to society at large.

Mr. Flower, the printer and editor of this Tract, is not correct in calling it the *fourth edition*. The author himself published the fourth edition in 1742; and another edition was printed at Aberdeen, by the late Professor David Fordyce, of that University.* The third edition, from which the present one appears to have been copied, was, however, the last that was "very much corrected and improved by the Author."

[We have to apologize to our readers for the omission of the concluding part of the Review of Bogue and Bennett's Hist. of Dissenters. The omission was owing to an accident which was not perceived until it was too late to rectify it. EDITOR.]

* Disney's Memoirs, &c. of Dr. Sykes. p. 20.

POETRY.

MAHOMET:

A PRIZE POEM, RECITED AT THE
THEATRE, OXFORD, IN THE YEAR
1808. BY MATTHEW ROLLESTON,
UNIVERSITY COLL.

Argument.—Subject proposed.—Mahomet's triumphant return to Mecca—Apostrophe to the Caaba—legends connected with it.—The Prophet's feelings on reviewing the cave of Hera—the poem now reverts to the first idea and development of his imposture, of which that cave had been the scene—obstacles to his early success—his courage under them—his flight from Mecca, and concealment in the cave of Thor—return to his present situation—he resolves to propagate his religion by the sword—his address to his soldiers, including a description of the Mahometan paradise and hell—its effect upon them—the conquest of Arabia—Mahomet, tired of war, resigns himself to pleasure—the loveliness of marriage superior to the delights of the Haram.—Mahomet's death—does not check the progress of his religion—the fall of Byzantium—the arms and doctrines of the Moslems overrun Palestine—Africa—India.—Conclusion.

Of him, th' Impostor, who, in Mecca's
fane,
Rear'd the dark throne of Falsehood's
impious reign;
Bade vanquish'd Faith confess his Pro-
phet-nod,
And bath'd in blood the altars of his
God;
Of him my Song would tell: nor Ye the
theme,
Nymphs of Castalia! scorn, by your
fair stream
Though yet unheard; for not more vast
his sway,
Who to Hydaspes urg'd his victor way;
From West to East his rapid thunders
hurl'd,
And still unsated, ask'd another world.

Hush'd is the war; the torn and
trampled slain
Tell that the fight was fierce on Beder's*
plain;
While Faith's dark banner, as a gorgeous
pall,
In awful triumph, waves from Mecca's
wall.
And see! where, raised above Medina's
bands,
High on the fane, th' Impostor-Prophet
stands:
The sword of Conquest slumbers in his
sheath,
And twice two hundred Idols blaze be-
neath.
No more, with burnish'd casque and
beamy lance,
In stern array, Mohammed's hosts ad-
vance;
In the mean Ibrahim † clad, with head
and feet
All bare, and naked to the blist'ring
heat,
Like lions tam'd, sedate in conscious
pride,
The warrior pilgrims swell the gath'ring
tide;
And, 'mid the loud-sung praise, or whis-
per'd vow,
In lowliest guise, before the Temple
bow.
Illustrious Fane! from age to age a-
dor'd
By despot chieftain, and by robber horde;
Pole-star of pray'r! to thee, at early
dawn,
Noon-tide, and eve, Faith's ardent eye
is drawn,
And from each clime, where zeal for
Islam burns,
Alike to thee, its hallow'd centre, turns;
To thee Arabia's loveliest gems belong;
Her sev'n-string'd ‡ Harp, her fairest
flowers of song.
And sacred is thy dome; for legends
feign,
Cloud-like, from heav
Mecca's plain;
And here, 'tis fabled, Hagar's outcast
child

* The scene of Mahomet's first great battle.

† The Ibrahim is the dress of the pilgrims.

‡ Alluding to the seven Arabian poems suspended in the Caaba.

Found peace and safety from the thirsty wild,
 Drank of thy * well, by Mercy's Angel led,
 And pillow'd on thy † stone his wearied head,
 Here too Mohammed first, by pow'r, by rage
 Unaw'd, dared ope the Koran's mystic page;
 And now, illustrious Fane, with heart elate,
 As bends once more the prophet at thy gate,
 Medina's lord, high thoughts, though ill repress'd,
 Yet mocking utterance, burn within his breast.
 But when by Eve's pale planet Hera's‡ cell,
 Dear, cherish'd scene, where pensive musings dwell,
 Lone he revisits, o'er his glowing soul
 Far livelier joys, far keener transports roll;
 Fond Mem'ry's touch recalls each faded hue,
 And all the past comes rushing on his view.
 For, in that cell, by that pale planet's light,
 Oft had he watch'd, in youth, the sleepless night,
 And there would sit in splenn thought, and brood
 O'er his first woes, his orphan § solitude;
 Would scan his high descent, his princely race,
 And the long line from sainted Ishmael trace.
 Then, how his soul would swell, his bosom beat,
 How flush his dark cheek with unwonted heat,
 As Fancy, with Ambition's phrensy warm'd
 Shapes dimly grand, and shadowy phantoms form'd!
 A new-born Faith, a Prophet's glorious name,
 Conquest, and kingly pow'r, and deathless fame
 Obscurely mingled, like a fev'rish dream,
 Or twilight landscape—but the sober beam
 Of rising Reason chas'd each wild'ring shade,
 And Fancy shrank from what herself had made.
 But still the star of Eve, as darkness fell,
 Saw the lone man in Hera's secret cell:
 Still, with new fires, Ambition's phrensy burn'd,
 Still Fancy's shadowy scene more strong return'd,
 And still th' Enthusiast drank, with greedier gaze,
 The dawning glories of succeeding days,
 And well-nigh deem'd some sacred impulse giv'n,
 Some Angel-vision from according Heav'n.
 Shapes, dim of late, by Hope's broad beam illum'd,
 A fuller form, a bolder tint assum'd;
 Till the vast Whole in bright succession mov'd,
 And Reason doubted, wonder'd, and approv'd.
 But few the fruits that crown'd his early toil,
 For rude the clime, and stubborn was the soil.
 Blind bigot Zeal, with Pride of jealous mind,
 And ancient Faith in hostile league combin'd:
 Vain then was Anger's threat, and Flattery's strain,
 And soft Persuasion's honied breath were vain.
 Yet burn'd unquench'd the fever of his soul,
 And Hope still spurr'd him to the glittering goal.
 Not, though (thus proud his vaunt||) the Solar blaze
 Should pour around him all his countless rays;

* The sacred well, *Zemzem*.

† A large black stone, usually styled "the stone of Abraham."

‡ A cavern at a small distance from Mecca, to which the youthful enthusiast nightly retired.

§ Mahomet was left an orphan at a very early age.

|| "If they should place the sun on my right hand, and the moon on my left, they should not divert me from my course." Gibbon's *Roman Empire*, vol. ix. p. 286.

Not, though, to check his glory's high career, The full orb'd Moon should quit her starry sphere; Not, o'er his head should crashing Thunders peal, And yawning Hell his last abyss reveal, Back would he shrink, but still right onward bear, And draw new fire, new fury from despair.	He hung with insect web the rock-stone rude, To tell that all within was solitude; ¶ Unseen, He snatch'd thee from th' unequal strife, And gave thee back to liberty and life. 'Tis thus, while Conquest waves his crimson wing, And prostrate Mecca hails her prophesying, As, oft through Hera's mountain-cave he strays, Comes o'er his breast the thought of other days; And it is sweet, 'mid Vict'ry's smiles to muse On Peril past, and Fortune's changeful hues, Sweet, as to weary mariner the roar Of winds and waves, that he shall tempt no more. For now is peril past, and toil and dread, Like the thin cloud at summer dawn, are fled; And with them Mercy vanish'd; the rude sound Of Triumph's joy her parting accents drown'd; Imposture casts th' unneeded veil away, And bares his front, unblushing, to the day; No flatt'ry now is his, no honied breath, Nought but the stern award, "Belief or Death." Gay shines the morn, and light the sunbeams glance From mail, and crested helm, and quiv'ring lance; Loud clangs the trump; with shout and martial state The answer'ing legions pour through Mecca's gate; Part borne aloft on neighing steed, and part On foot slow-pacing; but the same full heart Seems each to urge, as each with conscious might, Grasps the sheath'd blade, and, eager, pants for fight.
Not such his boast, when, thro' th' involving shade, Trembling, he fled before the Koreish blade; Not such, when, sad in Thor's * dark cave reclin'd, He caught the moanings of the midnight wind; While Terror heard, in ev'ry passing breath, The keen pursuer's step, the sound of death. Exile of Mecca! in that fearful hour, Who was thy shield, thy bulwark, and thy tow'r? Say, was it he, † that Seraph son of fire, Who wont thy lonely musings to inspire; Who bore thee thro' the night-air's dear expanse,‡ On wing more rapid than a shot-star's glance; Op'd to thy feet Heaven gate, and to thine eye Bar'd the full blaze of cloudless Deity? No—it was He, at whose divine command, Famine and Plague afflict the guilty land; Whose awful will th' unconscious winds perform, Who wings the lightning, and appoints the storm; His heav'nly counsels, too sublime for man, His secret mind decreed thy lengthen'd span; § He bade the dove her saving labours ply, To stay the intruding foot, the searching eye;	

* Three days and three nights Mahomet lay concealed in this cavern after his flight from Mecca.

† Gabriel, with whom the Impostor pretended to hold frequent converse.

‡ This alludes to his famous night-journey to heaven.

§ We are told, that when Mahomet was concealed in the cave of Thor, his pursuers were induced to retire, by the sight of a pigeon's nest and spider's web, whence they concluded the place was solitary and inviolate.

¶ He was overtaken by the Koreishites, but escaped.

And see, where tow'rs the prophet-chief
 on high,
 Strength nerves his arm, Defiance lights
 his eye!
 With kindling soul he views the length-
 'ning train,
 And holds, in pride of thought, unbound-
 ed reign;
 Then, as the glowing scenes his breast
 inspire,
 Lifts his tall spear, and pours the word
 of fire.
 "Soldiers of God! whose manly hearts
 beat high,
 With valorous zeal, and ardent piety;
 Who burn your prophet's name abroad
 to spread,
 And deal heav'n's vengeance on th' un-
 faithful head;
 Soldiers of God, with dauntless souls ad-
 vance,
 Smile at the sabre, and defy the lance!
 'Tis yours, if seam'd with many a hal-
 low'd scar,
 Stern Azrael* snatch you from the grasp
 of War,
 O'er Sirat's † bridge, with lightning-
 speed to fly,
 And spring at once to seven-fold ecstasy.
 Yes, it is your's 'mid argent fields to
 stray,
 Space without bound, and everlasting
 day;
 Gardens as Eden fair, where love shall
 strew
 Fresh flow'rs, fresh sweets, that Eden
 never knew;
 For Beauty, blooming in eternal charms,
 Wooes warrior Valour to her virgin
 arms;
 And, crown'd with thornless roses,
 young Desire
 Feeds Rapture's flame with never-dying
 fire.
 There, while your vermeil ‡ wounds
 atone each crime,

And add new grace to manhood's goodly
 prime,
 There, thro' green meads unwearied
 shall ye rove,
 Breathe the still freshness of the twilight
 grove,
 Or by some streamlet's palmy marge
 recline,
 And drain, uncheck'd, || rich juices of
 the vine,
 Till o'er each sense delicious langour
 creep,
 More soft, more soothing, than the dews
 of sleep.
 "Such is your lot, if Honour build
 your tomb;
 Not so, if coward Baseness seal your
 doom.
 "What, 'mid yon ¶ barren wilds, tho'
 whirlwinds bring
 Thirst and Despair upon their sanded
 wing;
 Yet heav'nly are those wilds to vaults,
 where Pain
 And scorpion Torments hold eternal
 reign.
 There, wrapt in fires, that ask no feeding
 oil,
 With fiercest heat your madd'ning brain
 shall boil,
 Till, parch'd and black, your flesh, by
 flames embrac'd
 Shrivels, like palm-leaves on the desert
 waste.
 Nor think, one drop from rank and
 stagnant pool,
 One smallest drop, your burning tongues
 shall cool;
 Worlds should not buy it; but one sul-
 ph'rous wave,
 Unfathom'd flood, your writhing limbs
 shall lave.**
 Then on to fight, and Allah nerve your
 hands!
 And lo! e'en now, methinks, Angelic††
 bands

* Azrael is the Angel of Death.

† A bridge, which, according to the Mahometan faith, all disembodied spirits must pass in their way either to paradise or hell: the former shall traverse it with "lightning-speed."

‡ "Their wounds shall be resplendent as vermilion." Gibbon.

|| Alluding to their present restriction from the use of wine.

¶ The soldiers complained of the heat of the desert; "hell is much hotter," replied the indignant prophet. Gibbon, vol. ix. p 319.

** All the preceding images, both of pleasure and pain, are accurately copied from the Koran.

†† It is fabled, that at the battle of Beder 3000 angels supported the troops of Mahomet, and that many of these heavenly warriors constantly accompanied his army.

Hang o'er our foes, and, from the car of flame
 Launch the red bolt, the forked lightnings aim.
 Not shrink! for know, to each th' Eternal Mind,
 Excluding chance, his death day hath assign'd;
 Peace could not shield from its predestin'd pow'r,
 War's thousand perils cannot haste its hour—
 Then on to fight! and be the battle-word,
 Woe to the Proud, the Koran or the Sword!"
 Swift as th' electric shock, the fervour runs
 From rank to rank, and burns thro' Mecca's sons.
 Hope leads the van; while press upon the rear
 Dishonour foul, and hell-foreboding fear:
 Instant each blade leaps willing from its sheath,
 And on they rush to conquest or to death.
 Weep, lost Arabia, land of sadness, weep!
 Rude o'er thy head the storms of battle sweep.
 Oft have thy deserts heard the angry roar
 Of midnight tiger, all athirst for gore;
 Oft have they seen the Simoom's purple blast
 Shed plague, and death, and ruin as it pass'd;
 Yet not the Simoom's blast, nor beast of night,
 Rag'd half so fierce as Mecca's fiends of fight.
 Dreadful they came; and as the torrent flood
 Rolls down its stream huge rock and ancient wood,
 Till all, save where some scatter'd stems remain,
 Lies one wide wat'ry scene, one liquid plain;
 So, thro' thy land, each tribe and wand'ring horde
 Sank trembling down before Mohammed's sword,
 And to the Koran's sterner rule resign'd
 The charter'd birthright of a free-born mind;
 Save that some nobler few, content to roam,
 Their wealth the jav'lin, and the waste their home,
 Dar'd live, tho' poor yet proud, tho' exil'd free,
 Or die, the martyr-sons of Liberty.
 But, sated now with blood, and bow'd with spoils,
 Shrinks Mecca's lord from war's severer toils,
 And, while his hell-hounds track the deadly scent,
 Sleeps in the rosy shade of Pleasure's tent,
 As round him Beauty's varied blossoms rise,
 On vagrant wing, from flow'r to flow'r he flies,
 And drinks, as chance or guiltier choice impels,
 Unhallow'd waters from an hundred wells.
 Slave of thy lawless will's imperious reign!
 Oh! had'st thou known to burst th' ignoble chain;
 Hadst known to quench the flame of wild desire,
 And light at Hymen's torch Love's chaster fire—
 Affection's smile had cheer'd thy parting gloom,
 And widow'd Virtue sorrow'd o'er thy tomb!
 For high the bliss that waits on wedded love,
 Best, purest emblem of the bliss above!
 To draw new raptures from another's joy;
 To share each grief, and half its sting destroy;
 Of one fond heart to be the slave and lord,
 Bless and be bless'd, adore and be ador'd;
 To own the link of soul, the chain of mind,
 Sublimest friendship, passion most refin'd;
 Passion, to life's last evening-hour still warm,
 And Friendship, brightest in the darkest storm—
 Lives there, but would, for blessings so divine,
 The crowded Haram's sullen joys resign!
 But still, Mohammed, rove; still bid thy soul
 Drain the foul dregs of pleasure's madd'ning bowl;
 Still swell thy pow'r, with pride still feed thy heart—
 Yet know, thy pow'r, thy pride shall soon depart!

For not the Haram's joys, not pleasure's draught,
 Tho' to its dregs the madd'ning bowl be quaff'd;
 Not all th' ideal prophet's high renown,
 The victor's laurel, and the monarch's crown,
 Can the slow * venom check, whose mortal force
 Hath thro' thy veins, for four long years, its course
 Wound unperceiv'd, and gradual, in its way,
 Pal'd thy cheek's bloom, and dimm'd thine eye-ball's day.
 Medina, thou whose guardian arm outspread
 First gave its safety to thy prophet's head!
 Again, fond city, ope thy sheltring breast,
 Again receive him to thy seat of rest!
 But not, as then, prepar'd his brow to gem
 With purple pomp, and kingly diadem,
 But his frail dust to shroud; for now his sun
 Is set in death's cold shade, his race is run;
 And O! may darkness, deep as ancient night,
 Close o'er his name, and veil it from the sight!
 Vain, fruitless wish! no mighty voice hath said,
 "Here, sea of ruin, shall thy waves be stay'd;"
 But still they roll resistless; on the tide
 Ensanguin'd Zeal and gaunt Ambition ride.
 Byzantium sinks o'erwhelm'd, and fades away
 The last faint beam of Latium's brighter day,
 While Rome's † proud Eagle, he, whose pinion's wav'd
 O'er Libya's strand, and Thule's tempest brav'd,
 With flagging wing, and crest to earth bow'd low,
 Indignant dies beneath a Moslem's blow.
 Alas for Palestine! her palmy vale,
 Her grove of nard that scented ev'ry gale,
 Her corn-lands thick with sheaves, her crystal rills,
 Her flocks that feed upon a thousand hills,
 Her faith—than flocks, and groves, and vales more dear—
 All own the triumphs of Medina's spear.
 For Afric weep! her rich and radiant store,
 From Ophir rifled, gem and golden ore;
 He ravag'd lands, that erst so beautiful smil'd,
 From Nile's fair bank to Niger's margin wild;
 Her sons, inmers'd in Slav'ry's darkest night,
 All tell the ruffian Moslem's conqu'ring might.
 But oh! if yet the tide of song may flow
 In sadder stream, and murmur deeper woe;
 If yet one tear be warm in Pity's urn—
 That tear, that song, to wasted India turn!
 For she was happy once; her citron groves
 Sigh'd to the whispers of the purest loves;
 Her proud Pagodas, in the first of time,
 Saw Science born, and wondrous Lore sublime;
 Lovely she slept in Cashmere's fairy bow'rs,
 Or sat enthron'd on Delhi's strength of tow'rs.
 How chang'd the scene! pale Hymen's altar falls;
 Th' impure Seraglio rears its prison-walls;
 Steals o'er the soul the Koran's chilling gloom,
 And Science westward bends her parting plume.
 But Time speeds on; and tho' th' impostor's pow'r
 Fiercely hath rag'd its dark and dreadful hour;
 Tho' rude o'er Afric's sands the whirlwind pass'd,
 And Asia rock'd beneath the rolling blast—
 Yet Hope, soft-smiling, lifts her seraph form,

* Mahomet died by slow poison, administered to him four years previous to his decease.

† Alluding to the removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople, and the subsequent conquest of that city by the votaries of Mahomet.

And points to sun-bright days, beyond the storm!	Bid ancient lore, and classic Taste refine Raise the low thought and harmonize the mind;
Hail, sun-bright days!—more fair, than was of old,	While heav'n-born Truth, (tho' dimm'd, forbid to fade,)
Saturnian age by fabling Fancy told— Hail, sun-bright days! bring on your radiant train,	With beam, more strong from Error's transient shade,
Peace, Mercy, Love, resume your halcyon reign;	Breaks forth unclouded, and on Mecca's night Pours the full flood of everlasting light.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The blessings of peace are restored certainly to the north of Europe, and there are many reasons for believing that the middle of Europe is freed from the calamities of war. Though our island is yet afflicted with the scourge of Providence, let us rejoice that the sword ceases to strike terror among a great number of our fellow creatures. Destruction and carnage have, we will hope, had their reign. May God incline the hearts of those, who still are continuing a contest, to measures which shall be for their mutual happiness: and seeing how little can be produced by war and bloodshed, may they learn to form a due estimate of human life, and be duly impressed with the truth of that religion which they profess to believe: that God is love—he does not delight in blood and war—that the peacemakers are the sons of God; but murderers, in the emphatical language of scripture, are justly styled sons of the Devil.

The peace was first made between Russia and Sweden, and the former power, in announcing it to its subjects, made great boasts of the prowess of its soldiers, and the glory acquired by their arms. We do not see much occasion for so much mighty boasting. Russia was in strength and population an overmatch for Sweden, and this latter unhappy country was under the dominion of a weak prince, incapable of guiding its energies to success. The peace leaves Sweden very much maimed. All Finland to the east of the gulph of Bothnia falls to the share of Russia, who according to the vulgar language of politics

was straitened in that quarter. Peter, the great, fixed his capital in the corner of his empire, and of course his successors wished for an accession of territory from their neighbours. This is now obtained to the utmost extent of the sovereign's wishes; but any one who looks at the space occupied on the globe by his territories, must smile with pity and contempt at the insatiable ambition of kings.

O! Si angulus-iste, said Horace, speaking of a small estate, and oh! if Finland is added to my domains, said a mighty monarch, whose kingdom was not half civilised, half cultivated, half peopled. You have obtained Finland, most mighty monarch; will this addition to your territories satisfy you? One of your predecessors added a great part of Poland and the Crimea, and made great acquisitions in Asia. She built cities, planned roads, and ports, and canals. In what state are all these projected improvements? Instead of increasing your territories, there is full fifty years employ to bring what you have into a state worthy of a king. There is full scope for the best ambition; and if you were to leave your neighbours to their own wranglings and disputings, and satisfy yourself with your own world, you might make it the seat of happiness and comfort, independent of the rest of mankind.

But what if Providence has determined that so large a portion of the globe should remain immersed in barbarism!—What if it should be designed to be the scourge of the civilized world?—to correct it when luxury has sapped

the foundations of morality and every manly feeling. Thus, the Roman empire was overthrown by barbarians, and writers have entertained fears for Europe from similar invasions. Russia will, however, for some time, find employment with its neighbours, still less improved in the arts of civilised life, and by the collision of such brute matter light may be struck out. The state of the war between Russia and Turkey is little known; but we may now expect a degree of activity, which will scatter dismay and terror on the banks of the Danube, and shores of the Euxine.

It is not ascertained that the peace is made between France and Austria. Every thing leads to the conjecture, that it is concluded; but Buonaparte is not returned to Paris, and as long as he stays at Vienna there is reason for doubt. He is one of those great characters

*Nil actum reputans dum quid
superasset agendum.*

He will complete his designs, and they will end in the complete humiliation of the house of Austria, and the probable exaltation of the house of Bavaria. Conjectures of various kinds are afloat, and will be so till the treaty of peace is seen. Russia seems to go hand in hand with Buonaparte, who according to his settled plan introduces improvement into the conquered countries. Vienna boasted of its index expurgatorius and gloried in the shackles with which it confined the mind. The best publications of foreign countries, particularly of our own, were prohibited. This index is destroyed. The press is completely at liberty, except on political subjects, namely, those in which the present state of the country is an object of discussion. With this also, toleration of religious opinions is encouraged, and the Austrians will have reason to bless the day which opened the road for a better order of things, than that which the house of Hapsburgh was willing to encourage. The chaining down of the human mind—by indices expurgatorii—by inquisitions,—by all the evils of monkery and priestcraft; is so great an evil, that whatever civil penalties may accompany the breaking of the fetters, they are easily to be endured in comparison of a galling yoke, which is a disgrace to our rational nature.

Great preparations are said to be making in France for the return of the Emperor. His first object will be the attempt to drive us from his coasts, and

all the intelligence from Walcheren is of so melancholy a nature, that such an attempt is greatly to be dreaded. Sickness has made terrible havoc with our troops. Ship-loads came away from the place; but the number of graves in the island, filled by the English, will make their descent remembered to the latest generations. Various circumstances led to this uncommon mortality. The autumnal rains, the inundations had great effect undoubtedly; but much more is to be attributed to the water being drunk without any preparation, and the spirits, which were very cheap, unmixed. To this may be added, the unripe fruit with which the orchards were full, and the cloathing not being adapted to the climate. One regiment is said to have preserved itself by a very simple and easy mode—by having large vessels of water, into which a small quantity of oatmeal was poured—the whole was then stirred together, and the water was not touched till the next day. This is of importance to be known in countries where the water is bad, which may by simple methods be freed from these impurities, which are the causes of great disorders.

Among other acts of Buonaparte, he is said to have ordered the Pope to be conveyed to Avignon, the temporary residence of some of his predecessors.—We cannot feel any sorrow upon this occasion; for, the removal of the Pope from that city, which is designated in prophecy as the seat of ecclesiastical tyranny, may be the weakening of his empire. It cannot, however, remove from us entirely the fear of a revival of that antichristian domination which had unbounded sway for so long a period. We recollect that if the Popes remained two-thirds of a century at Avignon, they returned to Rome again, and we cannot rejoice completely over fallen Babylon, as long as so great a body of christians acknowledges a priest to be the vicar of Christ upon earth, and the head under him of his church.

In Spain the Sovereign, at Madrid, continues his work of destruction of the pretended spiritual powers. The treasures of priest-craft and monkery are daily confiscated, and edicts are proclaimed in favour of the liberty of the press. The Junta at Seville takes no such steps for improvement, or rather renovation. Divisions prevail in it, and a regency is talked of in favour of the

Archbishop of Toledo. A regency of this kind does not augur any good to the Spanish cause; for, though he is a prince of the house of Bourbon, his education has not been of that kind to give him much interest in political affairs. He was kept away from all public business by the old court, as was his father, and the Spanish cause requires the utmost energy and activity. What influence our ambassador has there, time will discover, and it is evident that as soon as Buonaparte has settled his business in Germany, he will send such a number of troops into Spain as shall completely reduce it at least to temporary obedience to his brother.

The English troops in that country have made very little alteration in their position. The general, Lord Wellington, is said to have arrived at Lisbon, where he is to act in the new capacity of Viceroy, under the king of Portugal. With such power in his hands he will have the whole resources of that country at his command; but we can expect little from that unhappy region, where the powers of the human mind have been kept in subjection to so much ignorance, bigotry and superstition. We shall be curious to know whether the inquisition is to continue the exercise of its powers under the protestant viceroy, as the sanction of its cruelties by a protestant would form another strange feature of the extraordinary times in which we live.

The appointment of a protestant by the court at Brazil, appears to be a very extraordinary circumstance, when we consider the edict issued by that court against the liberty of the press in America. This latter fact does not astonish us at all; we are more surprized at the resistance made to it by the Brazilians, who have published strong remonstrances against it; and their writings indicate a vigour of mind, which we did not expect in that quarter of the world. It is scarcely probable that that country should be governed by the same measures which so debased Portugal; but we know too little of it to foresee in what manner the Brazilians will recover the rights of humanity.

At home the Jubilee of our sovereign's reign justly called forth those expressions of loyalty which the occasion required. The day was kept in London with all the solemnities of a public festival. The shops were shut up. The lord-mayor went in procession to St. Paul's, and

afterwards entertained the city and corporation at the Mansion-house; the guards fired three volleys; the bells rung at the churches; great guns were fired; and the night was ushered in by splendid illuminations at the public offices and the houses of many private individuals. The previous determination of several parishes to transfer the sums, intended for illumination, to charitable purposes, prevented that general display which would otherwise have been exhibited. Very considerable collections were made for the poor, and the king extended his mercy to all deserters from the army and navy. Sermons were preached at the various places of worship, and the Jewish synagogue is not to be forgotten amongst them. Mr. Belsham, at the Unitarian chapel in Essex-street, gave an excellent account of the origin of the institution of the Jubilee and its observance in Europe, and made some admirable and appropriate reflections on the peculiar occasion, which called for such a discourse; at the request of the congregation it has been printed. Addresses are expected to come up from all parts of England. We have seen only that from Nottingham, which we recommend to the perusal of our readers: in short all political differences were settled, as they ought to be on this occasion, and the whole country joined in congratulations to the sovereign "on the duration of his reign, and prayers for his future welfare and prosperity."

But the year of Jubilee, as far as politics are concerned, by no means commences under the most favourable auspices. The resignations of the Duke of Portland from ill health, and of Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh, from their bickerings and their duel, necessarily made a considerable vacancy in the ministry; to fill it up was matter of very great difficulty. The remaining part of the ministry naturally wished to keep their places, and overtures were made to Lords Grenville and Grey to join them, and to make those changes, which suited the contracting parties. Lord Grey was in the north of England when he received a letter from Mr. Perceval to this effect; to which he replied in a very spirited manner, that he would not connect himself with persons, whose measures were so diametrically opposite to his own. Lord Grenville came up to town from the west of England, but

finding that he was to be merely an adjunct to the ministry, he refused also to avail himself of the offer made to him. In fact it was evident that neither of these two lords could come into power, unless upon stipulations, to which the No Popery faction could never consent.

Thus rejected, the ministers applied to other persons to occupy the vacant places, and it is said were repulsed in various quarters. The filling up of a place cannot remain long a subject of difficulty. Persons will be found ready to occupy, who may not be able to do it with advantage. The business of the nation cannot remain at a stand, and happily for us the greatest and most important part is performed by subordinate officers, whose places cannot be changed so easily as those of the first offices of state. A ministry will soon be completed; it has an arduous task to perform. Enquiries will be made into the transactions at Talavera and Walcheren, and the Parliament will find sufficient business for discussion.

The disputes at the Theatre have not subsided, nor have the means taken to remove them been such, as either propriety or humanity would suggest. If the actors live as, as they themselves say, to please, they must not think of lording it over the public. Many individuals have been confined in prison, in consequence of the disturbances; and the plays are merely a dumb show, the audience turning their backs on the stage; and the noise is such, that females cannot frequent the place. The managers assert, that the public ought to be satisfied with the report made by the committee that inspected the accounts; but on the other hand it is asserted, that there are two parties in this business, the managers and the public: that the managers laid their own documents be-

fore the arbiters, but there was no one to speak in favour of the public. That there is a considerable evil no one can deny, though the remedy is not easily found. The whole will doubtless be investigated at a proper tribunal, and laws will be made to ascertain, in a better manner, the privileges of those who take upon themselves to find amusements for the public.

But we turn our eyes willingly from the theatre and its disputes, to a scene in which we are more deeply interested. The chapel at Hackney has been known by the labours of a Price and a Priestley, and the doctrine of one only God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has been received by a large and respectable congregation. It became necessary to build a new place of worship, and the foundation stone was placed by Mr. Aspland, with appropriate ceremonies. The inscription on it declared, that the future building was to be appropriated to the worship of the only true God: and, after laying the stone, Mr. Aspland, in a discourse admirably suited to the occasion, expatiated on the nature of christian worship and of true christian liberty. The discourse was evangelical, and came home to the heart. We understand that it will be printed, and trust that its diffusion will tend to make those of our brethren who are apt to place too much reliance in religious matters on the commands and dictates of men, to have a more favourable idea of those who trust only in their Saviour, and look up to him as their only teacher. A numerous assembly dined together afterwards, and spent the day in christian harmony. They did not forget to celebrate the cause for which Servetus lost his wife, Biddle his liberty, and Lindsey his emoluments.

INTELLIGENCE.

QUARTERLY ASSOCIATION OF PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS IN MANCHESTER AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.

A yearly meeting, called the *Provincial*, of the Presbyterian Ministers in the counties of Lancaster and Chester, is of long standing, and continues to be conducted on principles truly liberal and evangelical. A considerable number of

the ministers in the two counties belong to a Society, in a manner attached to this, called the Widows' Fund, the business of which is transacted on the day after the Provincial. This institution has existed for, I believe, about 30

years or more, and has been found eminently useful for answering the purposes for which it was formed—for relieving the widows and children of deceased Ministers, and for granting relief to the Ministers themselves when superannuated or indigent. It was at the institution of this Society that Dr. Priestley preached the Sermon on the *Duty of not living to ourselves*, so much and so justly celebrated.

About a year since, several Ministers of the above-mentioned denomination, residing in this town and neighbourhood, expressed a wish to form a *Quarterly Meeting*, as a means of still greater utility. For the purpose of promoting this object, a circular letter, signed by two gentlemen, was addressed to the Ministers in Manchester and its vicinity, of which the following extract contains the most material part—

“From occasional conversation on the state and circumstances of our affairs as a denomination of dissenters, it has appeared to us, that a quarterly meeting of the Ministers resident in this town, and within a given distance, would be attended with great advantages, advantages which the yearly association, however in other respects useful and agreeable, cannot in the nature of things comprehend.

“A meeting of this nature, we are humbly of opinion, would impart a new impulse and zeal to its different members to pursue with greater vigour the peculiar work, labours and study of their sacred profession and its duties; it would afford an opportunity, now wanting, of co-operation and brotherly sympathy, in those cases in which they might be advantageously displayed; it would give the younger Ministers an opportunity, which at present they do not possess, of exercising and improving their talents in their Ministerial capacity, and of calling forth exertions which might otherwise lie dormant; it would afford an opportunity of asking and receiving mutual advice on a variety of occasions and emergencies, and it would be the most efficacious means of arousing the zeal of congregations, and of drawing their attention to their true interests as Protestant Dissenters, and to many objects now neglected.

“The above considerations induce us to desire your co-operation to establish such a meeting in this neighbourhood, which is instituted from motives of utility

alone, and which will be conducted on liberal christian principles.”

In consequence of this letter, nine or ten of the Ministers to whom it was addressed met in Manchester, and digested a plan for the meeting proposed, which has since been approved of by several gentlemen not present, and which, I hope, will long continue to be acted upon with zeal and unanimity. Though the local provisions and regulations of this plan cannot be generally interesting, yet it may not be improper to state, that the meetings will be held in succession at every chapel, the Minister of which has become a member of the association, and not be confined to some of the larger towns; by which an equal deference will be manifested to all the congregations and ministers, and an equal interest excited in all; whereas if it were confined to one or two of the larger towns, it would excite but little interest, become a matter of course, be discouraged and discontinued.

The first meeting of the Quarterly Association was held at Monton on Good Friday, as being a day of leisure, in the chapel of the Rev. Robert Smethurst. The devotional parts of the service were conducted by the Rev. J. Holland, and a discourse appropriate to the occasion was preached by the Rev. Wm. Hawkes. This discourse was so much approved of in general, and so much in unison with the sentiments of the institutors and promoters of the association, that the Ministers present, with many lay gentlemen, successfully solicited the preacher to consent to its publication.

After the service, about ten Ministers, and a greater number of lay gentlemen, sat down to an economical dinner; from the conclusion of which to the company's breaking up, the interval was devoted to free and instructive conversation, and to adjust some parts of the plan before formed, with a view to greater general convenience.

The second meeting of the Quarterly Association, at mid-summer, coinciding with the Provincial or Yearly Association, and, as it were, absorbed in it, does not lie within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Quarterly Meeting; he will, therefore, only observe that it was held at Hale-barn, near Altringham, in the chapel of the Rev. Mr. Harrop.

The third meeting of the Quarterly Association was held at Stockport, in the chapel of the Rev. Mr. Higginson.

In this the Secretary was directed to send an account of each meeting for insertion in the Monthly Repository, and the Preacher to furnish him with an abstract of his discourse. This however, he is under the necessity of deferring at present, for want of time. But an account of the Stockport meeting, together with

an abstract of the Rev. Mr. Holland's sermon, furnished by himself, will be ready for the next Number of the Repository, if the editor should approve of their insertion.

W. J.

Manchester,
October 10, 1809.

SUFFOLK HUMANE SOCIETY.

The knowledge of what others have done to benefit their fellow creatures, is one of the best modes of rendering ourselves useful to society. When those actions are performed that have peculiar excellence in themselves, more especially if undertaken by the lower classes, they deserve to receive the greatest publicity. The following narrative will not, therefore, it is hoped, be deemed unsuited to a publication, the avowed object of which is diffusing useful knowledge, and inculcating benevolent exertions:

December 16, 1808, Edward Ellis and three other men were in a small boat searching for anchors off the shore at Lowestoff; they saw a ship wrecked at a distance; they immediately rowed towards the vessel; she was lying on her side, with the sea breaking completely over her. Another boat was launched from the beach, a person from the wreck having been seen waving his hat as a sign of distress; the boats could not approach the vessel because of the violence of the waves; a rope was, however, thrown from them to the persons on the wreck, this was fastened round their bodies, and they were all dragged through the water into the boats. Amongst the number, which was nine, were two women, and a child about seven months old, who were almost perished with wet and cold; the child was quite naked when dragged through the water; when taken into the boat it shewed no signs of life. Immediately upon its being freed from the rope with which it had been pulled from the wreck, Edward Ellis stripped off his own flannel waistcoat and great coat in which he wrapped the child, and placing it on his knees, and stooping forward to shelter it from the pinching blast, conveyed it to the shore. As soon as the crew were landed, though the child still shewed no symptoms of life, and the parties present believed it dead, James Farrer, jun. ran with the child, covered as before-mentioned, to Martha Longstaff, who resides on the beach at Lowestoff; she

took the child, supposing it dead, but as she had heard that warmth and rubbing are the most likely means of restoring those in whom animation is only suspended, she immediately stripped herself and went into a warm bed, and placed the child close to her body: when warmth and rubbing had been applied for three quarters of an hour, the child breathed, animation returned, and in a short time was restored. She is the daughter of Wm. and Mary Stephens, of Bridlington, Yorkshire. This narrative was fully proved to be true to the Suffolk Humane Society, August 2, who liberally rewarded those who had exerted themselves in a manner so peculiarly meritorious.

For the use of our readers we copy the following:

SUSPENDED RESPIRATION.

Cases of suspended respiration from drowning, frequently occur where no medical assistance can be immediately procured, and many valuable lives are in consequence lost from improper treatment, which might have been preserved had more appropriate means been used.

The Suffolk Humane Society, to prevent as far as possible, the occurrence of the like fatal consequences in future, recommends the following directions to be observed, till medical assistance can be obtained—

As soon as the body is taken from the water, convey it, with the head and shoulders raised, to the nearest house, having first untied the neck-cloth, and removed every impediment to respiration. Then strip off the clothes, wipe the body dry, and carefully clean the mouth and nostrils.

Place the body (the head still raised) on a bed or upon blankets, on a low table, in a warm but airy room in winter, or in the sun in summer.

Six persons are as many as can be usefully employed, and not more than that number should be admitted into the room.

Let one person close the mouth and

one nostril; another press the lower end of the prominent part of the wind-pipe (called the *pomum adami*) backward, whilst a third blows into the open nostril by means of a pair of bellows, 'till the chest be a little raised; the air should then be allowed to escape, and its expulsion assisted by gentle pressure on the chest; after this process has been repeated three or four times, rub the whole body, and particularly the right breast, with oil or hog's lard, which will prevent the ill effects of friction.

This plan should be continued for at least *four hours*, warmth being at the same time applied to the feet and hands, by means of bladders, or bottles of warm water, or hot sand bags; if a warm bath can be procured, the patient may be, with advantage, immersed in it, up to the shoulders, as whatever tends to pre-

serve the warmth of the body, without vitiating the air, is useful.

As soon as a pulse at the wrist, or beating of the heart can be felt, stimulate the inside of the nostrils by touching them with spirit of hartshorn, or *sal volatile*, and inject, by means of an elastic tube and syringe (if the person be unable to swallow) a spoonful or two of warm wine, brandy, rum, or gin and water, and repeat it every five or ten minutes, till a wine glass or two has been consumed. When the natural respiration is restored, put the person in a warm bed, and suffer him to remain quiet.

All rough treatment, such as rolling the body on casks, holding it up by the heels, &c. should be carefully avoided.

Medical assistance should in all cases be provided as speedily as possible.

METHODIST CONFERENCE.

By several adjournments, from July 31 to August 17, was held, at Manchester, the 66th General Annual Conference of the Wesleyan Methodists: Thomas Taylor, President; Joseph Benson, Secretary. 259 preachers attended. These indefatigable christians continue to increase in numbers, and, we trust, in respectability. There have been of late, several spirited, not to say severe attacks made upon this sect, which it has repelled with no small degree of acrimony. The third department of the Methodist Magazine, entitled "The Truth of God Defended," has latterly exhibited no contemptible specimen of the editor's skill in theological bush-fighting—Amidst the scowling of the storm, the force of argument on one hand, and the shafts of satire and reproach on the other, the Wesleyan brethren keep their ground with astonishing firmness. When driven to the last extremity, they can still "number the people," quietly retire to count the thousands and the tens of thousands in the City-road treasury-chest, and then exultingly exclaim—

—*Populus me sibilat at mibi plaudo*
Iste domi, simul ac nummos contemtor in
arca. Horace.

Since the last year * they have proselyted an immense number of persons, both male and female; viz.—in Great

Britain 5,431, and in Ireland 1,285, making a total increase of 6,716 members. The public has again to lament that "the American Minutes are mislaid," by which we are debarred the pleasure of knowing, with "accuracy," the number of new members on the other side of the Atlantic; but we are assured that "the increase of numbers in the United States, the last year, exceeds 8,000."

The numbers in Society† are now as follow: West Indies 12,508, Great Britain and Ireland 157,921, Gibraltar and Africa 20, British dominions in America 1,121, United States of America 159,500. Total number of the Methodist Society throughout the world, 331,090!!!

Thirty-seven persons have been admitted on trial as travelling preachers; sixty-five preachers formerly admitted, still remain on trial, not having travelled four years; ten preachers have died during the year that is past; two have "desisted from travelling; and thirty-one have been "admitted into FULL CONNECTION this year." The total number of travelling preachers in the United Kingdom is now 695. Upon the whole, it appears, that since the last Conference, there has been, throughout the world, a real increase of about 13,559 members! so that about 1,157 Metho-

* See M. Rep. Vol. III. p. 522.

† By persons in Society, are meant members or communicants as distinguished from mere hearers; the latter we should suppose must be to the former as four to one.

dists must have died, "gone into the world" or seceded—during the last 12 months; nearly the number of the whole of the Methodist population in Ireland. What numbers have thus "fallen away" in America, the mortifying circumstance of a *royal* mislaying the American Minutes, prevents us from ascertaining. The trans-atlantic brethren, however, go on gloriously, and tell us, that "not only in the towns and populous cities, and the country adjacent to the Atlantic, they have seen the pleasure of the Lord prosper in their hand, but also to the westward and beyond the river Ohio, to the Mississippi and the Missouri, we have seen the *travel* of the Redeemer's soul *coming home to God!*"

We have this year no new list of chapels building, or ordered to be built, but we have, in lieu thereof, orders for upwards of 70 public collections for the

support of chapel building in various parts of the kingdom. After all, it is painful to learn, that the Conference is very deeply in debt; but this is not a breach of the Conference rules—"Never to go into debt without a probability of being able to pay," and "Never to pawn any thing, *no not to save life*;"—the life of Conference hangs not on so slender a thread.—The old rule is ordered to be strictly enforced, which enjoins that "every circuit shall average one penny per week, and one shilling per quarter, each member." This will keep the City-road Company from sinking. Had other sects but half the zeal and perseverance by which the Wesleyans are actuated, we should soon have no longer to say to our neighbours—"Know ye the Lord."—In some sense or other, "we should all know him."

H. E.

NEW GRAVEL-PIT MEETING-HOUSE.

On Monday, the 16th of October, was laid the first stone of a new Meeting-House, for the use of the Unitarian Congregation, at Hackney. At four o'clock in the afternoon, the Minister of the congregation, and a considerable number of the subscribers and their friends, proceeded from the old Meeting-House to the site of the new one, which is on the side of Paradise Field. Here the stone was laid in the usual form by Mr. Aspland, in the presence of some hundreds of spectators. This ceremony was followed by an oration, on the general principles and objects of the Gravel-Pit congregation. The fineness of the weather contributed much to the agreeableness of this out-of-doors service.

From the ground, about 120 gentlemen adjourned to the Mermaid Tavern to dinner, Mr. Rutt in the Chair.

On the following Sunday morning, Mr. Aspland, at the request of the congregation, delivered a sermon to a crowded auditory, on the justifiableness of Dissent from National Churches, from John xviii. 36. Application has been made by the congregation, for the printing both of the oration and the sermon.

The following is the inscription on the foundation stone:

SACRED TO THE ONE GOD, THE FATHER.

THIS STONE IS LAID AS THE FOUNDATION OF A BUILDING, FOR THE USE OF THE CONGREGATION OF UNITARIAN CHRISTIANS, ASSEMBLING IN THE GRAVEL-PIT MEETING-HOUSE, IN THIS VICINITY, MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, ANNO DOMINI 1809.

ROBERT ASPLAND, Minister.
EBENEZER JOHNSTONE, Treasurer.
EDMUND AIKIN, Architect.

MR. ROSCOE.

In our last Number we had the satisfaction of recording a spirited act of humanity in behalf of some poor Africans, performed by this gentleman. We have now the pleasure of giving our readers information of a generous acknowledgment of his great merits as a public character, by our professed national enemies. Paris papers of the 10th instant, state, that on the 5th inst. the Royal Institution of Amsterdam chose Mr.

Roscoe a corresponding member, in the place of Muller, the Swiss, lately deceased. Such acts as this abate the rancour of national hostility, and alone, perhaps, prove that modern warlike nations are not absolutely barbarous. It would give us unspeakable pleasure to record similar acts of magnanimity on the part of our own country. Are Britons only insensible to all excellence that is not British?

THE JUBILEE.

On this extraordinary day, which we believe posterity will look back upon with surprise and pity, we have no room for remarks in the present Number; but we will collect in our next all the particulars which shall have been published of the *Religious Proceedings* of the day, and shall probably make some observations upon them. They may be of more use when the public have cooled than in the present state of men's minds. We shall be obliged to any of our readers who will favour us with Jubilee news: especially as to the services of the Dis-senters. Their published sermons will be noticed in our Review department.

The following is the form of prayer and thanksgiving put out by authority for the 25th inst. being the day on which the King, 49 years ago, came to the throne, otherwise the Jubilee. It is a curious specimen of prayers made and said by command; the beginning and the ending of it, which we have marked with italics, are scarcely to be paralleled; uttered extempore in the Tabernacle, it would have been called nonsense.

CHRISTIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

We have the satisfaction of announcing that this Society have published No. I. of their Series of Tracts; viz. "William's Return, or Good News for Cottagers," which perhaps the Monthly Repository may claim the honour of having given birth to. The price of it (six-pence) may seem objectionable; but it will be seen by the readers of it, that considering its length, 60 pages, it could not have been sold at a cheaper rate; and any abridgement of it must have been injurious. Considerable allowance is made to the purchasers of quantities, as appears from the following prices: 3s. a dozen; or, 11. 13s. 4d. a hundred, in any quantity not less than a quarter of a hundred. The committee have resolved that six copies of No. 1 (or, "William's Return") shall be presented to every subscriber, on his application by person or proxy to the publishers. Future allotments of this and other Nos. will be made according to circumstances.

The society have two other tracts, viz. Nos. 2 and 3, in the press. They will be announced in our next.

It is extremely desirable that the tracts should be put into the hands of small shopkeepers and hawkers; the committee will therefore be obliged to their friends in the various parts of the kingdom to forward this object.

The first annual meeting of the society

"O God, in whose hands are the issues of life and death, and to whom alone it belongeth to *distribute mercies, as well in lengthening as in shortening the days of men*, we yield thee praise and thanksgiving for the protection thou hast vouchsafed to our gracious Sovereign, during a long and arduous reign. Continue, we pray thee, thy watchfulness over him; shield him from the open attacks of his enemies, and from hidden dangers; from the arrow that flieth by day, and from the pestilence that walketh in darkness; enlighten his counsels for the public good; strengthen all his measures; and when it shall seem fit to thine unerring wisdom, perfect the ends of both; the restoration of peace and security to his People, of concord and independence to contending and bleeding nations.—*These blessings and mercies, we implore for our Sovereign, ourselves, our allies, and our enemies*, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen."

will be held on the third Wednesday in November, viz. Wednesday, Nov. 15, at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate-street. The chair will be taken for business at 4 o'clock *precisely*; a report will be read from the committee, and officers will be elected for the ensuing year. The Subscribers and their friends will afterwards dine together.

As the committee, with a view to enabling the society to sell its publications cheap, pay all their tradesmen's bills with ready money, they request subscribers to pay up their subscriptions for the current year.

Communications and subscriptions, are received by the following gentlemen, of whom also tickets may be had (price 7s. 6d.) for the dinner.

Mr. James Esdaile, Treasurer.
Rev. Robert Aspland, Secretary.

COMMITTEE.

Mr. Joshua Erookes.
John Christie.
James Esdaile, Junr.
Thomas Foster.
William Friend.
Thomas Gibson.
Ebenezer Johnstone.
Samuel Parkes.

Dr. Samuel Pett.
Mr. John Towill Rutt.
Robert Wainewright.

Mr. John Marsom, Collector.

OBITUARY.

Died, On Sunday, October 1st, 1857, in the 66th year of his age, Mr. WILLIAM NOTCUTT, of Ipswich. His death was occasioned by an injury received in falling from a gig. He was firm in his attachment to the uncorrupted gospel of Jesus Christ, nor was his heart a stranger to the real power and practice of religion. Integrity, mildness, and compassion habitually regulated his demeanour in the walks of private and social life, so that few persons have passed through the world, at once more respected and more beloved. While the writer pays this humble tribute to the memory of departed worth, he cannot withhold the affectionate expression of his sympathy with a bereaved and mourning family.

"The friendly band no more shall greet

"Accents familiar once and sweet!

"No more the well-known features trace!

"No more renew the fond embrace!"

Yet, in the circle where Mr. Notcutt's removal is most deplored, the indulgent

tenderness of his disposition, and all those gentle, unostentatious virtues which caused him to be so attractive, must sooth reflection and awaken hope. Nor let us dare, ignorant and sinful as we are, to arraign the rectitude of that Providence which thus rends asunder the happiest bonds of communion upon earth. Merciful is the stroke that corrects our mistaken judgments, and teaches us the true estimate of life, that enlivens our conviction of our own weakness and insufficiency, and demonstrates to us the infinite importance of our Maker's favour and the vanity of all human things. It is the christian's privilege to be assured that the vale of death opens into fairer and more lasting scenes. There, the wise and good, redeemed from the power of mortality and refined from every imperfection, will know more of God, his dealings and his designs; there—O reviving prospect! kindred spirits will be inseparably re-united, and no groans will mingle with their songs of peace and joy. B.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A. Z. who complains of the irregular serving of the *Monthly Repository*, at Chesterfield, is informed that there can be no other cause of this irregularity, than the negligence of his bookseller. The *Monthly Repository* comes out as early as any other periodical publication. The editor has nothing to do with the distribution of it.

The following communications are intended for publication:—I. D. on the Unity of God.—"A Churchman's" Reasons for being "A Churchman."—"A Rational Dissenter of the Old School," on the decline of Presbyterian Congregations.—Mr. Drummond, of Ipswich, on the refusal of Burial to the Children of Unitarian Dissenters.—Geron on Mr. Farmer's Hypothesis of Christ's Temptation.—Chariclo's Doctrine of an incarnate Ascension, reconsidered.—R. McIntyre on Christ's coming into the World.—A Plain Christian on Christ's being the only begotten Son of God.—A Dialogue on Endless Punishment.—On the notion of Two Natures in Christ.—Rusticus's Third Letter on Original Sin.—A Constant Reader's Reply to an Inconstant Reader's Defence of the Trinity.

The Case at Preston is only locally interesting.

Subscriptions received by the Editor.

For the Rev. F. STONE's annuity,

The Unitarian Congregation, Bridport

£100 0 0

For the Rev. J. GIBBURN's, New Meeting-House, Saham,

The Unitarian Congregation, Norwich

10 10 0

Besides smaller contributions from individuals.—The Editor will be happy to receive further subscriptions on account of these objects.

The Subscribers to the *Monthly Repository* are informed, that Nos. xiii. xiv. and xv., which have been for some time out of print, and for which repeated demands have been made, are now reprinted, and may be had of the Publishers. It is earnestly recommended to Subscribers to complete their sets, without delay, in order to obviate future similar disappointments. Single numbers may be had, price 1s. each; and Vols. I. and II. in boards, price 12s. 6d. each, and Vol. III. in boards, including the Supplement, price 13s. 6d.